

Kasvatustieteellisiä tutkimuksia, numero 94
Helsinki Studies in Education, number 94

Tuuli From

Speaking of space

**An ethnographic study of language policy, spatiality and power
in bilingual educational settings**

Doctoral dissertation, to be presented for public discussion with the permission of the Faculty of Educational Sciences of the University of Helsinki, in Auditorium 107, Athena Building (Siltavuorenpenger 3A), on the 23rd of October, 2020 at 4 pm.

Helsinki 2020

Pre-examiners

Assistant Professor Anu Muhonen, University of Toronto, Canada
Associate Professor Nigel Musk, University of Linköping, Sweden

Custos

Professor Gunilla Holm, University of Helsinki

Supervisors

Professor Fritjof Sahlström, Åbo Akademi University, Finland
Professor Gunilla Holm, University of Helsinki
Professor Elisabet Öhrn, University of Gothenburg, Sweden

Opponent

Professor Monica Heller, University of Toronto, Canada

Cover image

Hannu From

Yliopistopaino Unigrafia, Helsinki

ISBN 978-951-51-6507-7 (paperback)

ISBN 978-951-51-6508-4 (PDF)

ISSN 1798-8322 (print)

ISSN 2489-2297 (online)

Tuuli From

Speaking of space:

An ethnographic study of language policy, spatiality and power in bilingual educational settings

Abstract

This study considers questions related to language policy, space and power in the context of co-located Finnish- and Swedish-speaking schools in Finland and a bilingual Sweden Finnish school in Sweden. Finland is an officially bilingual country with Finnish and Swedish as national languages, and basic education is organised separately for both language groups. In consequence, the Swedish-speaking schools in Finland are monolingual and there are no bilingual schools providing education in both Finnish and Swedish. The separation of the national languages in the educational system of Finland has been pointed out in societal and scientific debate as protecting the vitality of Swedish in Finland. At the same time, the lack of bilingual schools has been increasingly presented as problematic with regard to promoting linguistic diversity and language learning. However, along with the Finnish municipalities' recent tendency to co-locate educational institutions in shared facilities, co-locations of monolingual Finnish- and Swedish-speaking schools have become more common. In co-located school campuses, Finnish- and Swedish-speaking schools share the school facilities but function as separate administrative units and engage in mutual activities if they wish. In Sweden, Finnish has been officially recognised as a national minority language since 2000. The present language and education legislation provides the pupils with a Finnish background the right to use and develop their language and cultural identity in education. However, the problems related to the realisation of bilingual education for the Sweden Finns have been extensively pointed out. Bilingual education in Finnish and Swedish is organised for the most part outside the public school system in independent Sweden Finnish schools, whose availability in Sweden is increasingly restricted.

The study is informed by critical and post-structuralist notions on the study of language and language policies, as well as theorisations of space and spatiality taking shape particularly in the fields of critical and cultural geography. The spatiality of language policies is framed and approached through the following questions: what kinds of meanings is space given in educational language policy discourses? How do national language policies participate in the construction of spatial orders in institutional education? What kinds of subject positions are available to the actors in these spatial orders and how are these positions negotiated in the

everyday lives of educational institutions? In this dissertation, language policies are conceptualised as multi-sited; as ideologies, language planning and language practices that operate in multiple dimensions of space and time. A specific interest is the negotiation of language policies in daily school life and the spatial orders they contribute to. Therefore, the overall methodological framework of this dissertation is ethnographic. The ethnographic data was generated at various sites: co-located primary and high school campuses in Finland and a bilingual Swedish Finnish school in Sweden. The data consists of participant observations, video recordings, interviews with school staff and photo-elicitation interviews with pupils. Moreover, the first article, utilises data consisting of texts published in Finnish newspapers as well as staff interviews from other co-located school campuses in Finland. The analysis of the ethnographic data is contextualised in contemporary education and language policies in Finland and Sweden.

This dissertation consists of three articles and a summary part. The first article analyses the discourses and practices related to the spatial separation of the national languages in the educational system of Finland by introducing the concept of cultural space. The second article examines the recognition of linguistic value and the spatiality of linguistic resources in language policy discourse and the everyday practices of co-located and bilingual schools. The third article scrutinises the interplay between spatial ideologies and spatial practices in the context of language and education by analysing how the premise of language separation is conceptualised, managed and negotiated in co-located schools in Finland and the bilingual school in Sweden. The findings indicate that spatial ideologies were present in many ways in how language policies were discussed and practiced in the schools studied. Space was understood as symbolic, material, political and strategic. Particularly in the context of minority language education, space was ascribed meanings that reflected the felt linguistic power relations and their management. The premise of language management was a rather conventional understanding of languages as countable and bounded entities, whose hierarchies were defined along with national language policies. The physical school space and its possession was typically presented by the school staff as a precondition for the protection of a minority language. Moreover, language and education policies were seen as crucial in providing spatial autonomy for minority language speakers. However, like the language agendas, the premises and goals of spatial language management varied among the co-located schools and the bilingual school. In Finland, the reconstruction of a Swedish-speaking school space was understood as a spatial ideology established in the institutions, whereas in Sweden the Finnish-speaking spaces were considered to be repeatedly reconstructed by the educators through the daily spatial practices. In the Swedish-speaking school in Finland, the spatial management was framed by the presence of the Finnish-speaking school as a potential threat, which also seemed to strengthen the underlying norm of monolingualism and the ideal of a monolingual space. However, this study also shows that

co-located campuses can be considered as sites in which the premise of linguistic and spatial separation of the national languages in education is challenged and re-negotiated. In the co-located campuses of this study, pupils and students displayed awareness of the language boundaries constructed through the separation of physical space and educational practices. The separation seemed to cause alienation between the pupils and students in these schools but resistance to the linguistic and cultural categories was also articulated and practised.

In the Sweden Finnish school in Sweden, the shortcomings in language and minority policies were pointed out by the educators as threatening the position of Finnish in the Swedish educational system. The policies were understood as having failed to provide physical and symbolic spaces for Finnish in Swedish society, of which the unpredictable situation of bilingual schools being seen as a consequence. The ethnographic observations show that in addition to the shortcomings in minority and language policies, the present marketisation of education policies had tangible implications for the everyday life of the Sweden Finnish school. The representations related to Finnish in Sweden seem to be changing but were still classed and devaluing in places, which, according to the ethnographic data, seemed to hinder the recognition of Finnish as a right and a resource. This, in turn, might complicate the successful operation of Sweden Finnish independent schools. In the co-located schools in Finland, by contrast, the established societal position and cultural value related to Swedish in Finland was reflected in how the spatial autonomy of Swedish-speaking schools was treated. This study concludes that observing language policies through their spatial dimension in language policy discourses as well as in educational practice enables a more profound understanding of their connection to equality and difference-making in education.

Keywords: language policy, spatiality, language minorities, bilingual school, co-located school, ethnography

Tuuli From

Tilasta puheen ollen:

Etnografinen tutkimus kielipolitiikasta, tilallisuudesta ja vallasta kaksikielisissä koulutusyhteyksissä

Tiivistelmä

Tässä tutkimuksessa tarkastellaan kielipolitiikkaan, tilaan ja valtaan liittyviä kysymyksiä suomen- ja ruotsinkielisissä kieliparikouluissa Suomessa sekä kaksikielisessä ruotsinsuomalaisessa koulussa Ruotsissa. Suomi on virallisesti kaksikielinen maa, jonka kansalliskielet suomi ja ruotsi on erotettu toisistaan perusopetuksessa. Sen seurauksena Suomen ruotsinkieliset koulut ovat yksikielisiä eikä maassa ole kaksikielistä opetusta suomeksi ja ruotsiksi tarjoavia peruskouluja. Julkisessa ja tieteellisessä keskustelussa kansalliskielten eriyttäminen koulutusjärjestelmässä on esitetty ruotsin elinvoimaisuutta tukevaksi tekijäksi. Toisaalta kaksikielisten koulujen puuttumista on alettu yhä enenevässä määrin pitää ongelmallisena kielellisen moninaisuuden ja kielenoppimisen näkökulmasta. Oppilaitosten keskittäminen samoihin tiloihin kunnissa on yleistynyt viime vuosina ja myös suomen- ja ruotsinkielisten koulujen jakamista kampuksista on tullut tavalisempia. Näissä kieliparikouluissa yksikieliset suomen- ja ruotsinkieliset koulut toimivat samassa kiinteistössä erillisinä hallinnollisina yksiköinä ja jakavat arkeen tapauskohtaisesti. Ruotsissa suomen kieli on tunnustettu kansalliseksi vähemmistökieleksi vuodesta 2000. Kieli- ja koulutuslainsäädäntö antaa suomalais- taustaisille oppilaille oikeuden käyttää ja kehittää kieltään ja kulttuurista identiteettiään koulutuksessa. Kaksikieliseen opetukseen liittyvät saatavuusongelmat Ruotsissa ovat kuitenkin yleisesti tiedossa. Kaksikielistä opetusta suomeksi ja ruotsiksi järjestetään pääasiassa julkisen koulujärjestelmän ulkopuolella ruotsin-suomalaisissa vapaakouluissa, joiden määrä Ruotsissa on viime vuosina jatkuvasti laskenut.

Tutkimus paikantuu kriittiseen ja jälkistrukturalistiseen kielen- ja kielipolitiikantutkimukseen sekä tilan ja tilallisuuden teoretisointeihin, joita on kehitetty erityisesti kriittisen ja kulttuurimaantieteen kentillä. Kielipolitiikan tilallisuutta lähestytään ja rajataan seuraavien tutkimuskysymysten kautta: Millaisia merkityksiä tilalle annetaan koulutusta koskevissa kielipoliittisissa diskursseissa? Miten kansallinen kielipolitiikka osallistuu tilallisten järjestysten rakentumiseen koulutusinstituutiossa? Millaisia subjektipositioita näissä tilallisissa järjestyksissä on tarjolla ja miten niistä neuvotellaan oppilaitosten arjessa? Tässä tutkimuksessa kielipolitiikkaa käsitteellistetään monipaikkaisena; ideologioina, kielisuunnitteluna ja kielikäytäntöinä, jotka toimivat moninaisissa tilan ja ajan ulottuvuuksissa.

Kiinnostus kohdentuu erityisesti kielipolitiikasta koulun arjessa käytäviin neuvotteluihin ja niissä rakentuviin tilallisiin järjestyksiin. Väitöskirjan metodologinen viitekehys on etnografinen. Tutkimuksen etnografinen aineisto on tuotettu useassa paikassa: kahdella suomalaisella kieliparikampuksella, jossa suomen- ja ruotsinkieliset alakoulut ja vastaavasti lukiot jakavat koulutilat sekä kaksikielisessä ruotsinsuomalaisessa koulussa Ruotsissa. Aineisto koostuu havaintomuistiinpanoista, videonauhoitteista, henkilöstöhaastatteluista sekä valokuvahaastatteluista oppilaiden kanssa. Ensimmäisessä artikkelissa on analysoitu lisäksi suomalaisissa sanomalehdissä julkaistuja kirjoituksia sekä henkilöstöhaastatteluja muista kieliparikouluista Suomessa. Etnografisen aineiston analyysi kiinnittyy Suomen ja Ruotsin kieli- ja koulutuspoliittisiin konteksteihin.

Väitöskirja koostuu kolmesta artikkelista ja yhteenveto-osasta. Ensimmäisessä artikkelissa analysoidaan diskursseja ja käytäntöjä, jotka liittyvät kansalliskielten tilalliseen eriyttämiseen suomalaisessa koulutusjärjestelmässä. Näiden perusteella esitellään kulttuurisen tilan käsite. Toisessa artikkelissa tarkastellaan kielen arvon tunnistamista ja kielellisten resurssien tilallisuutta kielipoliittisissa diskursseissa sekä kieliparikoulujen ja kaksikielisen koulun arjisissa käytännöissä. Kolmannessa artikkelissa pureudutaan tilaa koskevien ideologioiden ja käytäntöjen vuorovaikutukseen analysoimalla, miten kielten erottamista käsitteellisestään ja hallitaan sekä miten siitä neuvotellaan kieliparikouluissa ja kaksikielisessä koulussa. Tulokset osoittavat, että tilaa koskevat ideologiat olivat monella tapaa läsnä kielipolitiikkaan liittyvissä keskusteluissa ja käytännöissä tutkittavissa kouluissa. Tilaa ymmärrettiin vertauskuvallisena, materiaalisena, poliittisena ja strategisena. Erityisesti vähemmistökielikoulutuksen kontekstissa tilan saamat merkitykset heijastelivat koettuja valtasuhteita ja niiden hallintaa. Kielellisen hallinnan lähtökohdaksi oli melko tavanomainen ymmärrys kielistä rajattuina entiteetteinä, joiden hierarkiat määritteli kansallisessa kielipolitiikassa. Fyysinen koulutila ja sen hallinta nähtiin vähemmistönäkökulmasta ehtona vähemmistökielen suojelemiselle, ja kieli- ja koulutuspolitiikan tärkeäksi tehtäväksi ymmärrettiin tämän tilallisen autonomian turvaaminen. Kuten kielelliset agendat, myös tilan ja kielen hallinnan lähtökohdat ja tavoitteet olivat kieliparikouluissa ja kaksikielisessä koulussa keskenään erilaiset. Suomessa ruotsinkielisen koulutilan uusintaminen ymmärrettiin tilallisena ideologiana, joka kiinnittyi yksikieliseen instituutioon, siinä missä Ruotsissa suomenkielinen tila nähtiin jatkuvasti arjisissa koulutuskäytännöissä tuotettavana. Ruotsinkielisessä koulussa tilallista hallintaa kehysti suomenkielisen koulun läsnäolo mahdollisena uhkana, mikä vaikutti myös voimistavan yksikielistä normia ja yksikielisen tilan ideaalia. Tämä tutkimus osoittaa kuitenkin myös sen, että kieliparikoulut voidaan nähdä paikkoina, joissa kielellisen ja tilallisen eriyttämisen oletusta haastetaan ja neuvotellaan uudelleen. Tämän tutkimuksen kieliparikouluissa oppilaat ja opiskelijat osoittivat tietoisuutta fyysisen tilan ja koulunkäynnin eriyttämisen kautta rakentuneista kielirajoista. Erillisyys vaikutti

etäännyttävän eri koulujen oppilaita ja opiskelijoita toisistaan mutta kielellisiä ja kulttuurisia kategorioita myös kyseenalaistettiin sanoin ja käytäntein.

Ruotsinsuomalaisessa koulussa pedagogit esittivät kieli- ja vähemmistöpolitiikan puutteiden uhkaavan suomen kielen asemaa ruotsalaisessa koulutusjärjestelmässä. Poliitiikan ymmärrettiin epäonnistuneen suomenkielisen fyysisen ja symbolisen tilan tuottamisessa ruotsalaisessa yhteiskunnassa, mihin myös ruotsinsuomalaisten koulujen arvaamattoman aseman esitettiin liittyvän. Etnografiset havainnot osoittavat, että kieli- ja vähemmistöpoliittisten puutteiden lisäksi myös koulutuksen markkinoistuminen näkyi ruotsinsuomalaisen koulun arjessa. Suomen kieleen Ruotsissa liitetyt representaatiot ovat muuttumassa myönteisemmiksi mutta ovat silti edelleen paikoin luokittuneita ja väheksyviä, mikä etnografisen aineiston perusteella näytti vaikeuttavan suomen kielen tunnistamista oikeutena ja resurssina. Tämä puolestaan kaventaa ruotsinsuomalaisten vapaakoulujen toimintaedellytyksiä. Suomen kieliparikouluissa ruotsin kielen vakiintunut yhteiskunnallinen asema ja kulttuurinen arvo sen sijaan heijastui siihen miten ruotsinkielisten koulujen tilalliseen autonomiaan suhtauduttiin. Johtopäätöksenä esitän, että tarkastelemalla kielipolitiikkaa tilallisen ulottuvuuden kautta niin kielipoliittisissa diskursseissa kuin koulutuksen käytännöissä voidaan ymmärtää syvällisemmin sen kytköstä koulutukselliseen tasa-arvoon ja erontekoihin.

Avainsanat: kielipolitiikka, tilallisuus, kielivähemmistöt, kaksikielinen koulu, kieliparikoulu, etnografia

Tuuli From

På tal om rum:

En etnografisk studie språkpolicy, spatialitet och makt i tvåspråkiga utbildningsmiljöer

Sammanfattning

Denna studie granskar frågor som anknyter till språkpolicy, rum och makt i finsk- och svenskspråkiga samlokaliserade skolor i Finland samt i en tvåspråkig sverigefinsk skola i Sverige. Finland är officiellt ett tvåspråkigt land vars nationella språk finska och svenska har separerats inom den grundläggande utbildningen. Som konsekvens är de svenskspråkiga skolorna i Finland enspråkiga och det finns inte tvåspråkiga skolor som skulle erbjuda undervisning både på finska och svenska. I den offentliga och vetenskapliga debatten har separationen av de nationella språken ansetts skydda det svenska språkets livskraft i Finland. Å andra sidan, har man i större grad också börjat se avsaknaden av tvåspråkiga skolor som problematisk i relation till språklig mångfald och språkinläring. Under de senaste åren har centraliseringen av flera pedagogiska institutioner under samma tak i kommunerna blivit allt vanligare, även gällande samlokaliseringar av finsk- och svenskspråkiga skolor. I dessa samlokaliserade skolor delar finsk- och svenskspråkiga skolor fastigheterna men fungerar som separata administrativa enheter och delar sin vardagliga verksamhet i varierande grad. I Sverige har finska erkänts som ett nationellt minoritetsspråk sedan år 2000. Språk- och utbildningslagstiftningen ger barn med finsk bakgrund rätt att använda och utveckla sitt språk och sin kulturella identitet i undervisningen. Problemen gällande tillgång till tvåspråkig undervisning för sverigefinnar är ändå allmänt kända. Tvåspråkig undervisning på finska och svenska organiseras huvudsakligen utanför det offentliga skolsystemet i sverigefinska friskolor, vars antal i Sverige har sjunkit ständigt under de senaste åren.

Studien använder sig av kritiska och poststrukturalistiska teorier inom språk- och språkpolicyforskning samt teorier om rum och spatialitet som har utvecklats särskilt inom kritisk geografi och kulturgeografi. Spatialitet inom språkpolicy närmas och avgränsas genom följande forskningsfrågor: Vilka betydelser ges rum i diskurser om utbildning och språkpolicy? Hur deltar nationella språkpolicyer i konstruktionen av rumslig ordning inom utbildningsinstitutionen? Hurdana subjektspositioner är tillgängliga för aktörerna inom dessa rum och hur förhandlas kring positionerna i skolinstitutionernas vardag? I den här avhandlingen förstås språkpolicy som ideologier, språkplanering och språkpraktik som fungerar mång-

dimensionellt i tid och rum. Intresset riktas särskilt mot förhandling av språkpolicy i skolans vardag och den rumsliga ordning den bidrar till. Därav är den övergripande metoden för avhandlingen etnografi. Etnografisk data samlades in i flera miljöer: två samlokaliserade skolor i Finland där finsk- och svenskspråkiga grundskolor respektive gymnasier delar skolutrymmen, samt i en sverigefinsk skola i Sverige. Materialet består av observationsanteckningar, videoinspelningar, intervjuer med skolpersonal, samt intervjuer om fotografier med elever. I den första artikeln analyseras även texter ur finländska dagstidningar samt intervjuer med skolpersonal från andra samlokaliserade skolor i Finland. Analysen av det etnografiska materialet anknyter till de utbildningspolitiska kontexterna och språkpolicyerna i Finland och Sverige.

Avhandlingen består av tre artiklar och en sammanfattning. I den första artikeln analyseras diskurser och praxis som berör den rumsliga åtskillnaden av nationalspråken i det finländska skolsystemet och begreppet kulturellt rum presenteras. I den andra artikeln granskas erkännandet av språks värde och språkliga resursers spatialitet i språkpolicydiskurser, samt i vardaglig praktik i samlokaliserade och tvåspråkiga skolor. Resultaten visar att ideologier som berör rum var närvarande på flera sätt i diskussioner och praktik som berörde språkpolicy i de undersökta skolorna. Rum förstods som symboliskt, materiellt, politiskt och strategiskt. Speciellt i kontexten av minoritetsspråkutbildning tillskrevs rum betydelser som reflekterade de upplevda språkliga maktrelationerna och deras styrning. Utgångspunkten för språkstyrningen var den konventionella förståelsen av språk som skilda enheter, vars hierarkier bestäms genom nationell språkpolicy. Skolpersonalen såg det fysiska rummet i skolan och dess styrning från ett minoritetsperspektiv som en förutsättning för beskyddandet av minoritetsspråket. Vidare ansågs språk- och utbildningspolicyer ha en viktig uppgift i skapandet av rumslig autonomi för talare av minoritetsspråket. Liksom språkstrategierna, varierade också premisserna och målen för rumslig språklig styrning mellan de samlokaliserade skolorna och den tvåspråkiga skolan. I Finland förstods rekonstruktionen av skolan som ett svenskspråkigt rum som en institutionellt etablerad rumslig ideologi, medan de finskspråkiga rummen i Sverige ansågs behöva rekonstrueras om och om igen genom de dagliga rumsliga praktikerna. I de svenskspråkiga skolorna i Finland påverkades den rumsliga styrningen av att närvaron av den finskspråkiga skolan sågs som ett potentiellt hot, vilket också verkade stärka den underliggande enspråkighetsnormen och idealet om ett enspråkigt rum. Samtidigt visar studien att samlokaliserade skolor kan förstås som platser där premisserna för språklig och rumslig separation av nationalspråken inom utbildning blir utmanade och omförhandlade. I de studerade samlokaliserade skolorna visade eleverna medvetenhet om de språkliga barriärer som konstruerades genom separeringen av det fysiska rummet och skolornas praktik. Separeringen verkade skapa alienering mellan eleverna i dessa skolor, men de uttryckte också motstånd mot de språkliga och kulturella kategorierna.

I den sverigefinska skolan i Sverige pekades bristerna i språk och minoritetspolicyer ut av lärarna som hot mot finskans position i det svenska skolsystemet. Policyerna ansågs ha misslyckats med att erbjuda fysiska och symboliska rum för finskan i det svenska samhället, varav en konsekvens ansågs vara den oförutsägbara situationen för tvåspråkiga skolor. De etnografiska observationerna visar att utöver bristerna i minoritets- och språkpolicy, hade utbildningens marknadsorientering märkbara konsekvenser för vardagen i den sverigefinska skolan. Representationer av det finska språket i Sverige håller på att förändras mot det positivare, men är fortfarande delvis nedvärderande och relaterade till klass, vilket enligt det etnografiska materialet verkade förhindra erkännandet av finska som en rättighet och resurs. Detta försämrar i sin tur de sverigefinska friskolornas verksamhetsmöjligheter. I de samlokaliserade skolorna i Finland reflekterades däremot den etablerade position och det kulturella värde som svenskan i Finland tillskrivs i hur den rumsliga autonomin för svenskspråkiga skolorna behandlades. Som slutsats visar jag att genom att granska språkpolicy genom den rumsliga dimensionen i både språkpolicydiskurser och utbildningspraktik går det att djupare förstå dess koppling till jämlikhet och skillnadsgörande inom utbildning.

Nyckelord: språkpolicy, spatialitet, språkminoriteter, tvåspråkig skola, samlokaliserad skola, etnografi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As I am writing these acknowledgements, the summer is about to turn into an autumn, the circumstances of which are yet difficult to foresee. However, it is probable that the current pandemic will prevent me from having the pleasure to finish this research process in the same physical space with all the people I wish could be present. Instead, I aim to express my gratitude to all of you from a safe distance. To begin with, I wish to thank the participants of this study. The pupils and adults in the three field schools in Finland and Sweden, thank you for letting me in to have a peek in your everyday lives and welcoming me with such warmth and curiosity. Kiitos, tack, you challenged my thinking and gave a voice to this study. Moreover, I want to thank the activists and experts, with whom I have had the privilege to share thoughts with while conducting the research in Finland and Sweden.

The Nordic Centre of Excellence Justice through Education (JustEd) enabled me to focus on research full-time, for which I am grateful. I also want to thank *The Society of Swedish Literature in Finland (SLS)* for supporting my research for almost a year. Besides material continuity, I consider myself lucky to have had so many people supporting me in this process. I want to thank the dynamic trio, my supervisors Fritjof Sahlström, Gunilla Holm and Elisabet Öhrn for providing me with their expertise and support in the more winding parts of the research process. Fritjof, näiden vuosien aikana molempien elämissä on tapahtunut kaikenlaista ikävää ja odottamatonta mutta työasioissa ei ole tullut vastaan sellaista pulmaa, jossa näkemyksestäsi ei olisi ollut apua. Ongelmanratkaisukykyysi ja empaattinen otteesi ohjaajana, esimiehenä ja työkaverina ovat olleet korvaamaton tuki tällä matkalla. Gunilla, tack för ditt pragmatiska handledningsgrepp och de skarpa kommentarerna som har hjälpt mig att uppfatta det väsentliga om min forskning. Det har varit skönt att kunna lita på att du ställer dig bakom oss som ännu befinner oss i början av den ibland gropiga forskarstigen. Elisabet, perioderna hos dig vid Göteborgs universitet har varit bland de mest produktiva och inspirerande under den här resan. Tack för din kloka handledning och din etnografiska expertis, samt diskussionerna vi haft om forskning och livet som händer vid sidan av den.

I am indebted to my pre-examinators, Assistant Professor Anu Muhonen and Associate Professor Nigel Musk for your thorough, supportive and critical reading of my work. You gave me valuable insights into the final refinements of this thesis. Professor Monica Heller, thank you for agreeing to act as my opponent. Your work has been an inspiration for me throughout the years and I cannot think of a better way to conclude this process than to discuss the thesis with you, even if I would prefer a shorter geographical distance.

The bunker, bunkkeri, as we affectionately tend to call our working space located in the basement of the Psychologicum building has been a headquarters of the most wonderful collective during the years. Jenni Helakorpi, Ina Juva, Ida Hummelstedt, Aarno Kauppila, Iida Pyy, Sonja Raunio, Jussi Ikkala, Jenny Ståhlberg, Eva Louro, Touko Vaahtera and Alina Inkinen; your professional and personal support has been one of the most important factors in my well-being during this time. Jenni ja Ina, tärkeä parvi on kannatellut myös altaan syvässä päässä. Kiitos ystävydestä ja siitä, että oman uskon loppuessa on sitä voinut aina ammentaa lisää teiltä. Ida, kiitos lämmöstä ja empatiasta töissä ja vapaa-ajalla. Olen onnekas, kun myöhemmin olemme tulleet jakaneeksi paljon muutakin kuin sen tietokoneen ja muistitikun, jotka sinulta perin. Tack även för språkhjälpen! Aarno, olemme jakaneet työhuonearkea hyvällä menestyksellä sekä Helsingissä että Göteborgissa. Kiitos kiperistä keskustelunavauksista, huumorin kukkasista ja ennen kaikkea ystävydestä. Gunilla's research seminar for doctoral candidates at the Faculty of Educational Sciences has been a safe space for critical discussions, constructive feedback and a sense of belonging – topped with a sufficient amount of motivational chocolate. My heartfelt thanks to everyone who participated throughout the years, particularly Solveig Cornér, Denice Haldin, Jenni Helakorpi, Ida Hummelstedt, Jenny Högström, Ina Juva, Eva Louro, Katarina Perander-Norrgård, Iida Pyy and Tuija Veintie.

All my brilliant colleagues at the Siltavuorenpenger campus during the years: Hanna Guttorm, Riikka Hohti, Heidi Huilla, Pia Mikander, Anna-Maija Niemi, Antti Paakkari, Virpi Pakkanen, Saija Volmari, Hannele Pitkänen, Ameera Masoud, Sara Juvonen, Linda Maria Laaksonen, Tommy Wallenius, Lauri Ojalehto, Mari Simola, Sonja Kosunen, Tuuli Kurki, Reetta Mietola, Elina Ikävalko, Anna-Leena Riitaoja, Kata Mertanen, Tuure Tammi, Eeva Rontu, Verner Valasmo, Tuija Veintie and many others. I am grateful to each one of you for the shared lunches and coffees at Olivia, talks and laughs along the corridors, seminars, conference travels and parties during the years. Elina Lahelma and Sirpa Lappalainen, thank you for your inspirational work in the field of feminist school ethnography and in the *Cultural and feminist education research group* (KUFÉ) at our faculty, which has also been a safe and an encouraging space for many of the people mentioned here. A special thanks to Mikael Kivelä for technical support during the fieldwork. Heidi, kiitos jokaisesta yhdessä tallatusta kilometristä entisillä kotikulmilla. Niiden jälkeen askel on aina tuntunut kevyemmältä. Anna-Maija, kiitos kaikesta yhteisestä ja siitä, että esimerkilläsi innostat ajattelemaan tulevaisuutta tutkimuksen parissa. Saija, kiitos paljosta, erityisesti sydämellisen sarkasmin ja ehetyttömän elämänviisauden ääreen katetuista aamiaisista. Antti, kiitos ystävydestä, loistavasta matkaseurasta Suomen ja Euroopan rautateillä sekä akateemiseen työskentelyyn liittyvistä näkemyksistä, joihin usein mieleissäni palaan.

Språkmöten, a joint project between the University of Helsinki and Åbo Akademi in Vasa introduced me to the joy of working together as a research team in a

supportive and a cheerful atmosphere. For me Språkmöten was also a full-on language immersion, for which I am indebted to Fritjof Sahlström, Anna Slotte, Michaela Pörn, Linda Martelius, Liselott Forsman and Fredrik Rusk.

I am privileged to be able to continue working at the University of Helsinki after finishing this dissertation. Thanks to the research team in the project *Multilingual Didactics and Dialogues* (DIDIA), which I currently have the pleasure to be a part of: Anna Slotte, Maria Ahlholm, Gunilla Holm, Riitta Juvonen, Kia-Maria Niemi, Marjo Savijärvi, Kirsi Wallinheimo and Harriet Zilliacus. Anna, vi har hunnit komma en lång väg tillsammans och jag är glad över att få återkomma till analysen av olika språkmöten med dig. Sonja Kosunen, thank you for initiating a new, inspiring collaboration as well as connecting me to the research community *Social Studies in Urban Education* (SURE).

Being a part of JustEd has also brought along many new acquaintances from outside the University of Helsinki with whom I am particularly happy to have crossed paths. Thank you to the participants of JustEd summer schools and seminars in Hanasaari, Voksenåsen and Gothenburg. Your feedback and support has been valuable. Dennis Beach, Monica Johansson and Andreas Ottemo, thank you for making me feel welcome during my research visits at the University of Gothenburg and helping out with a number of practical issues. Dennis, Monica and Elisabet, thank you for a pleasant writing experience with our joint article on spatial justice. Many thanks for peer support to Heikki Kinnari, Junghyun Joon, Kalypso Filippou and Sonia Lempinen from the University of Turku as well as Valgerður S Bjarnadóttir from the University of Akureyri. Heikki, erityinen kiitos kaikista tuesta matkan varrella.

Tamás Peter Szabó and Petteri Laihonon, our mutual interest in grasping what co-located schools are about brought us together in 2017. Thank you for recognizing my work and inviting me in your research activities at the University of Jyväskylä. Your contribution to my thinking around co-located schools has been significant, not to mention that the time spent together around proposal writing and fieldwork has most often been fun. Pauliina Sopanen, thank you for sharing thoughts along the way! I hope we will get a chance to continue our discussions. Taina Saarinen, thank you for showing interest in the progress of my thesis and inviting me to participate in your research activities. I guess I finally reached the point where I no longer feel like constantly answering the question, “Well, is it ready yet?”

Rakkaat perhe ja ystävät, läsnäolonne on ollut tärkeä muistutus siitä, että elämää on myös ja ennen kaikkea yliopiston ulkopuolella, vaikka tämä työ on toisinaan verottanut liikaa voimia ja yhteistä aikaa. Isäni Hannu, Pete ja Veera, en voi kylliksi kiittää kaikesta yhteisestä. Äiti, on musertavaa, ettet enää ole täällä jakamassa tätä kaikkea mutta olen kiitollinen siitä, miten ehdit minua tähän matkaan valmistaa. Toisinaan projektinhallintataidoistasi olisi ollut apua tässäkin hommassa. Kiitos Hessulle, Merjalle, Tommille, Henkalle, Sannalle ja Kaisalle aina

ilahduttavista kokoontumisista milloin missäkin merkeissä. Sinikalle ja Jussille sydämellinen kiitos tuesta ja tarpeellisista täysihoitolomista Kuusankoskella. Valtava kiitos ystävydestä, kannattelusta ja naurusta rakkaat Ama, Hantta, Heidi, Jenni, Karri, Noora, Marleena, Mikko, Marre, Meeri, Susu, Tanja ja monet muut. Jenni, kiitos ihan kaikesta hiekkalaatikolta tähän päivään, olet esikuvani niin monella tapaa. Lari, kiitos korona-arjen jakamisesta ja siitä, että saan katsoa kanssasi myös sen jälkeiseen aikaan.

In Helsinki, August 2020,
Tuuli From

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	12
LIST OF ORIGINAL PUBLICATIONS	19
1 INTRODUCTION	21
2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	27
2.1 Language policy and power: Critical post-structuralist perspectives	27
2.2 Spatial theorisations in analysing the operation of language policies in everyday schooling	32
3 CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY	38
3.1 Swedish in the language policies and education system of Finland	38
3.2 Co-located schools as sites for negotiating the policy of language separation.....	42
3.3 Finnish in the language policies and education system of Sweden	44
3.4 Fostering the access to bilingual education in independent Sweden Finnish schools.....	47
4 THE RESEARCH PROCESS	51
4.1 The empirical settings for the articles of this dissertation	51
4.2 Ethnographic fieldwork	54
4.2.1 Negotiating entry	55
4.2.2 Participant observations and fieldnotes	60
4.2.3 Interviews with the school staff.....	66
4.2.4 Participant photography and photo-elicitation interviews with the pupils	68
4.2.5 Writing as analysis.....	72
4.3 Ethical considerations and researcher positionality	75
5 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	80
5.1 Article I: Shared places, separate spaces: Constructing cultural spaces through two national languages in Finland.....	80
5.2 Article II: Language crashes and shifting orientations: the construction and negotiation of linguistic value in bilingual school spaces in Finland and Sweden	81

5.3 Article III: ‘We are two languages here’: The operation of language policies through spatial ideologies and practices in a co-located and a bilingual school.....	83
6 DISCUSSION.....	85
6.1 Cultural spaces and spatial ideologies as approaches to language policy, spatiality and power in education	85
6.2 Negotiation of language boundaries, hierarchies and subject positions in everyday schooling	88
6.3 Language and spatiality in the recent tendencies of education policies in Finland and Sweden.....	92
6.4 Analysing language policies as the politics of space.....	94
REFERENCES	97
APPENDICES	113

LIST OF ORIGINAL PUBLICATIONS

- I** From, T. & Sahlström, F. (2017). Shared places, separate spaces: Constructing cultural spaces through two national languages in Finland. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 61(4), 465–478. doi: 10.1080/00313831.2016.1147074
- II** From, T. & Holm, G. (2019). Language crashes and shifting orientations: The construction and negotiation of linguistic value in bilingual school spaces in Finland and Sweden. *Language and Education*, 33(3), 195-210. doi: 10.1080/09500782.2018.1514045
- III** From, T. (2020). ‘We are two languages here’: The operation of language policies through spatial ideologies and practices in a co-located and a bilingual school. *Multilingua: Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1515/multi-2019-0008

1 INTRODUCTION

In the public debates of Swedish-medium education in Finland, a certain pair of words is likely to come up at some point of the debate. *Svenska rum*, Swedish space, refers to monolingual Swedish-speaking spaces in Finnish society, which are believed to be key to the protection of the status and vitality of Swedish, one of the two national languages in Finland. Swedish-medium education is organised in monolingual schools safeguarded through the legislation and these schools are many times presented as the most essential *svenska rum* in Finland. *Svenska rum* is a discourse about space; a site for linguistic and cultural meaning-making, but it is also material and social. It is reproduced through the walls, corridors and schoolyards of the Swedish-medium schools and the everyday life of the people there. As a discourse, *svenska rum* is a manifestation of spatial representation, power and autonomy of the Swedish-speaking minority in the Finnish society.

Across the Gulf of Bothnia, the Finnish-speaking national minority of Sweden faces rather different issues in terms of spatial representation. In the debates concerning Finnish-medium education in Sweden, the major concern seems to be the shortcomings in the availability of mother tongue instruction and bilingual education in general. In Swedish society and its institutional education, the few Sweden Finnish bilingual schools might be considered closest to representing *finska rum*, symbolic and material spaces for the Finnish language. Bilingual Sweden Finnish schools have a special character as educational institutions and linguistic spaces that are initiated and organised by the members of the minority themselves, yet in a rather different operational environment in terms of the language and educational policies than where the Swedish-speaking schools in Finland function.

At first glance, the two settings seem to have little in common. However, in this study I suggest that considering spatiality in educational language policy discourses and everyday educational practices provides a more nuanced understanding of the “competing rationalities underlying educational policy change, social inequity, and cultural practices”, as the Australian education researchers Kalervo Gulson and Colin Symes (2007, 98) anticipate the theoretical implications of the ‘spatial turn’ in educational studies in their 2007 article in *Critical Studies in Education*.

Institutional education in the modern nation-state can be considered as a key vehicle for nation-building and the transformation of pupils into national citizens. In this construct, language policies that participate in creating the linguistic hierarchies of the nation space are of major significance (Heller, 2011; Rajander, 2010; Shohamy, 2006). Linguistic anthropologist Susan Gal (2010) presents nation-states as geographical territories mediated by political practices and language ideologies. She continues: “When state boundaries and linguistic territories do not

match – as is often the case around the world – the result is political tension or the threat of political mobilisation” (ibid., 33–34). National language policies can be considered to be an intention to manage this threat or tension. In the linguistic hierarchies of modern nation-states, the management or governance of language, i.e., the standardisation of languages, designation and positioning of language groups and minorities is a central task of language policies. These policies can always be considered as having a spatial dimension, an aim to manage or control discourses of space or the ways in which space is used. Firstly, they manage representations and conceptualisations of space; in other words, shape the ways in which space is imagined and thought about in language policy contexts. Secondly, they contribute to spatial practices through creating premises for the use and appropriation of material space in institutional education (see Lefebvre, 1991; Hadi-Tabassum, 2006).

The connection between language, culture and territory is taken as a basis for the construction of the nation-state and the national identities that legitimise it (Martín Rojo, 2017). The narratives of modern nation-states have largely been constructed on the notion of one nation, one culture and one language. In the context of a modern nation-state, multilingualism has been considered as an undesirable deviation where the ideological principle has been that of an ethnolinguistic assumption, the idea of one nation and one language. Even today, the assumption of the link between language and culture in the context of a nation-state can be considered as a central mechanism in modern governmentality, and in particular, in governing monolingual and monocultural subjects (Blommaert, Leppänen & Spotti, 2012). However, nationality is a fixed and insufficient indicator for mapping the sociolinguistic spaces within nation-states. The ethnolinguistic assumption is founded on a mis-recognition of the complexity of the contemporary linguistic reality which, for example, is manifested in the hierarchies between languages (Blommaert, 2006; Blommaert, et al. 2012). As linguistic anthropologist Monica Heller (2006) points out, the concept of a linguistic minority only makes sense within the ideological framework of nationalism. Thus, the nation-state is the central context for constructing the policies naming and managing national and minority languages and putting them into practice.

The role of schools as venues where the national language policies are carried out and negotiated is an intersection of controversial ideologies and agendas, particularly in the context of minority language education (Heller 2006, 17, see also Lilja, Mård-Miettinen & Nikula, 2019). The contradictions created through linguistic power relations, such as the minority and the majority language, monolingualism and bilingualism, are not only spatial in a symbolical sense, but also material and embodied. The walls and barriers that are constructed in educational discourse and practice and become significant in the context of language policy and power are mental, social, and physical. Language policies in education are

substantially concerned with space and power, whether we look at policy discourses, institutional structures or the everyday education spaces. This link manifests itself in how languages gain and are allocated space in educational systems and how sociolinguistic boundaries and hierarchies are constructed in and out of classrooms (Hadi-Tabassum, 2006). In this dissertation, the spatial dimension is brought into discussion of language policies in education. Language policy discourses are multi-sited, constructed, reproduced and contested at different levels and at different times and places, and require a multidisciplinary analysis in order to grasp their various dimensions (Halonen, Ihalainen & Saarinen, 2015). This study aims to contribute to that particular call by combining theoretical and methodological perspectives from various disciplines and bringing them together in the framework of a spatial understanding.

Language policies participate in the construction of social difference, which largely also have spatial outcomes. The role of schools in the devaluation of certain linguistic varieties in relation to legitimate language can be considered central (Bourdieu, 1991). Monica Heller and Marilyn Martin-Jones (2001) argue that linguistic difference in education is a matter of symbolic domination and that legitimisation of power relations and distribution of resources are accomplished through linguistic practices. Thus, debates over linguistic norms are also arguments over controlling resources, education acting as a key site for these discussions. Language is essential in these processes since, firstly, it is a means for interaction and a resource for the reproduction of social difference. Secondly, language operates as a means of social categorisation and hierarchisation alongside other social differences, such as gender, ethnicity and social class. Hegemonisation and normalisation of power relations take place in mundane language practices, such as language choices in everyday encounters (Heller, 2011; Heller & Martin-Jones, 2001; Martin Rojo, 2017). Negotiations of linguistic competencies, ownership and boundaries in education often are manifest in spatial terms (Bagga-Gupta, 2010). This is a study of the various ways in which language policies shape and operate within material and the social space of the school. It is an ethnographic study about the spaces that are being constructed through language policies, the positions that are available to pupils and adults and about the social and linguistic hierarchies in which languages are organised within those spaces. In this study, a range of ethnographic data from co-located Finnish- and Swedish-speaking schools in Finland and from a bilingual Sweden Finnish school in Sweden enable a multi-sited and cross-cultural analysis of the spatialities (Gordon, Holland, Lahelma & Tolonen, 2005) that are constructed, negotiated and resisted when national language policies are transformed into educational practices. From a spatial language policy perspective, the mutual analysis of the positions of Swedish in Finland and Finnish in Sweden is particularly interesting. Finnish in Sweden lacks similar societal prestige and spatial autonomy like Swedish in Finland, and is still labelled in some

contexts as an immigrant language despite its present status as a national minority language (cf. Lainio, 2015).

My interest in conducting ethnographic research on language policies and spatiality started to emerge while I was working in Språkmöten (in English ‘language encounters’, 2011–2014), a joint project between Åbo Akademi University and the University of Helsinki studying co-located schools. The term co-located school refers to Finnish- and Swedish-speaking monolingual schools sharing the facilities but functioning as separate administrative units (see Sahlström, From & Slotte-Lüttge, 2013). They are a phenomenon the conceptualisation of which had only recently begun in Finnish educational research. The project applied video ethnography as a method for data production and had a particular interest in investigating interactional patterns among the students of the Finnish- and Swedish-speaking schools in question. I participated in the project as a research assistant responsible for producing video data at a recently co-located high school campus in the relatively Swedish-speaking region of Ostrobothnia and, later on, analysing the data. At the same time, a rather turbulent societal debate about the position and future of monolingual Swedish-speaking education in Finland was raging. In particular, the question of whether there should be bilingual schools with instruction in both Finnish and Swedish in Finland in addition to co-located schools provoked controversial views. To be able to follow the debate on national and regional Finnish- and Swedish-speaking media and other instances, while at the same time producing and analysing material from an educational context, which to some extent questioned the understanding of monolingual spaces, gave me a vantage point on the many dimensions of the ideology as a discourse and practice. Moreover, it evoked an interest in deconstructing the understanding of monolingual space in the context of language policies in education.

Applying critical ethnographic perspectives from the fields of educational and language studies, this dissertation sets out to improve the current understanding of the spatiality of language policies in educational institutions in Finland and Sweden. The multiple dimensions of language policy are understood as having spatial and material outcomes, which the ethnographic approach of this study will investigate. Thus, the point of this study is an understanding of language and education policies as spatial processes that are not only reproduced in the discourses on language policies in education but also shape the everyday realities of education in a material and social sense. These processes cannot be separated from broader language policy developments and most significantly the current multilingual ideologies in education. The shift in paradigms and policies towards multilingualism has also challenged the premise of language separation as a means of protecting minority languages (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017). In a broader sense, these developments are connected to the underlying rationalities of linguistic governance in national contexts (see also Rajander, 2010). Milani (2007) highlights the

tension between two different ideologies framing multilingualism in Swedish policy documents: while multilingualism has been seen as a positive societal phenomenon, Swedish as the common language has also been considered as a means for constructing social cohesion, which is presented as a foundation for the civil society (cf. Hult, 2004). Nikula, Saarinen, Pöyhönen and Kangasvieri (2012) point out that in the Finnish policy discourses multilingualism deriving from immigration has previously been presented as something that needs to be managed and downplayed, whereas the official bilingualism, Finnish and Swedish, is presented as a socially accepted form of multilingualism. However, a shift in the rhetoric regarding language awareness and linguistic diversity has taken place in the Finnish policies during the past decade (Alisaari, Heikkola, Commings & Acquah, 2019; Zilliacus, Holm & Sahlström, 2017). In the current Finnish national curriculum for basic education (Finnish National Agency for Education, 2014), multilingualism is articulated as a manifestation of cultural diversity that applies to everyone, including those considered as native speakers of the national languages. In the present national curriculum of Sweden (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2011/2018), by contrast, multilingualism is presented as something that students with a language other than Swedish are expected to absorb (Zilliacus, Paulsruud & Holm, 2017).

Positioning of the study, aim, and research questions

The aim of this study is to analyse the spatiality of language policies through investigating the meanings ascribed to space in institutional education. Moreover, an ethnographic analysis is undertaken on how these meanings, conceptualisations and representations are materialised and negotiated in the spatial practices of everyday education. The aim is approached through the following research questions:

RQ1. What kinds of meanings is space given in educational language policy discourses? (Articles I and III)

RQ2. How do national language policies contribute towards the construction of spatial orders – linguistic boundaries, linguistic hierarchies – in institutional education? (Articles I and II)

RQ3. What kinds of subject positions are available for the actors in these spatial orders and how are these positions negotiated in the everyday lives of educational institutions? (Articles I, II and III)

In order to achieve these aims and answer these questions, this study deploys an ethnographic paradigm, which enables the analysis of language policies as multi-sited, multidimensional and cross-cultural. Language policies, from this point of view, are understood as being carried out in the discourses concerning language policies as ideologies and language planning as well as in the mundane practices

of everyday life (Spolsky, 2004; Shohamy, 2006). In this study, these practices and negotiations around language policy and space are approached by observing everyday life in three educational institutions: two Finnish- and Swedish-speaking monolingual primary schools co-located in the same campus in Finland and a bilingual Sweden Finnish school in Sweden. Through the ethnographic analysis, the often-abstract conceptualisations of language-policy discourses concerning language management and separation are illustrated and materialised.

This dissertation consists of three articles and a summary. Article I lays out a spatial analytical framework on the educational language policies applying to the national languages in Finland by drawing on the video material and interviews conducted during the Språkmöten project as well as newspaper material, which was gathered for the purposes of my master's thesis (From, 2013). Article II and Article III shed light on the spatiality of language ideologies and language management by analysing material from the ethnographic fieldwork I carried out in both the co-located schools and the bilingual Sweden Finnish school during 2014-2015. This summary comprises six chapters. Following the introduction, Chapter 2 presents the theoretical perspectives this study adheres to in its understanding of the spatiality of language policies. Chapter 3, a context and a background for the study is provided by presenting the language and education policy contexts of Finland and Sweden, integrated into the body of previous research relevant for this study. Chapter 4 proceeds to present the research process, methodological framework and ethnographic considerations of this study. In Chapter 5, the central findings of the three articles are presented, and, finally, Chapter 6 enters into a discussion and conclusions concerning the findings of this study in relation to the general research questions proposed above.

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The theoretical framework of my research is shaped in the intersections of various academic disciplines. The guiding principle while navigating these fields in this study is the idea of language policies as multi-sited. The idea implies that the spaces constructed through language policy discourses are connected to the everyday spaces of education, and thus construct mutual spatialities (Halonen, Ihalainen & Saarinen, 2015). The manifestation of language policy discourses in the social and material school spaces can be approached through the everyday practices and ideologies around which the daily life in schools is organised. A central argument in this dissertation is that an analysis of how abstract and material space, represented and appropriated as a means for making and negotiating language policies, enhances the understanding of the present power relations in institutional education. Aligned with this aspiration, this study is informed by critical, post-structuralist perspectives on the study of language and language policy (García, Flores & Spotti, 2017; McNamara, 2011; Makoni & Pennycook, 2007), combined with a spatial analytical lens, emerging particularly from theorisations in the fields of critical and cultural geography (Aitken, 2001; Arias, 2010; Lefebvre, 1991; Massey, 1994; 2005). In this section, I will position my research in the theoretical discussions I wish to contribute to and present the theoretical conceptualisations that have been central to the analysis.

2.1 Language policy and power: Critical post-structuralist perspectives

In the history of language policy and planning, the tendency to present language management within nation-states as a neutral activity with unrecognised connections to power, discourse and ideology has been stubborn (Pennycook, 2001). However, there is an increasing need for critical analysis of discourses and practices related to multilingualism in the contemporary national contexts. Linguistic diversification of societies has led states to intensify their measures in language policy governance. Moreover, new forms of neoliberal governance have entered domains that have been managed by the state, particularly in the history of the Nordic societies. Consequently, as Heller and Duchêne (2012) claim, the discourses celebrating multilingualism and emphasising individual linguistic skills and competences as crucial are increasingly present in our times. Even though the

discourses emphasising multiculturalism and tolerance have become more mainstream in the era of so-called superdiversity,¹ the policies related to language, culture and diversity as well as the rhetoric of tolerance in fact appear as governance, which enables managing diversity while maintaining the dominant power relations (Rajander, 2010; Nikula et al., 2012). Blommaert and others (2012) suggest that the recognition of linguistic and cultural diversity in national language policies has actually strengthened the power of the ethnolinguistic assumption instead of promoting more flexible views on language and culture. The juxtaposition of celebrating and managing diversity becomes even more significant in the context of minority language education, where the necessity of governance is often legitimised through the need to protect minority languages (Salo 2012, 35).

According to Nikula and others (2012), the tone of discussing linguistic diversity in European policy documents varies from celebratory to managerial. In these documents, multilingualism is seen as both economically and culturally valuable and as a challenge that needs to be controlled and managed through effective language policy in order to realise the value of linguistic diversity. A similar dual vision can be found in the representations of bilingualism, which has been described as bringing prestige and power but as something problematic, both from a societal and individual perspective (Hélot & De Mejía, 2008). Nikula and others (2012) present language hierarchies and rankings as an instrument for the management of language through language policies. Examples of these rankings are such categorisations as national languages, second languages or minority languages, through which languages and their users are distributed into different subgroups and, by implication, accorded different societal statuses. While these labels are created in order to control the messy linguistic reality, they also serve as a justification for power hierarchies in European societies. Through language hierarchies, languages are classified and placed in different positions as “official”, “national” and “other”, in order to structure the diversifying situation rationally (Nikula et al. 2012). Representing language as essentialised countables is primarily an ideological act that sets a certain premise for the need to control and label contemporary multilingualism (Makoni & Mashiri, 2007; Makoni & Pennycook, 2007). Most importantly, given the scope of this study, these labelling practices also function as a means of drawing boundaries between languages in education spaces (Hadi-Tabassum, 2006).

In the current critical, post-structuralist and ethnographic approaches, language policies are typically understood and conceptualised as multi-sited and multidimensional processes implemented and negotiated across different scales of space (see e.g. Johnson & Johnson, 2015; Halonen, Ihalainen & Saarinen, 2015; Hornberger & Johnson, 2007). In a well-known classification, Bernard Spolsky (2004)

¹ Superdiversity refers to a paradigm shift in sociolinguistics and debates on contemporary linguistic diversity (cf. Blommaert et al. 2016).

suggests that language policy consists not only of documents and statements about what languages are to be used in a particular activity or setting (*language planning or management*) but also of beliefs and ideologies about what is beneficial to speakers (*language ideology*). Moreover, a third dimension of language policy, which Spolsky also considers the most central, is what happens among speakers (*language practice*) (cf. Shohamy, 2006; Boyd & Huss, 2017). Aligned with a similar understanding of language policies as multi-sited, Elana Shohamy (2006) distinguishes between overt and covert, explicit and implicit language policies. By overt and explicit, she refers to the policies that are stated through official documents, formalised and manifested explicitly. Covert and implicit language policies are the processes that can be derived by examining the implementation of policies as a variety of grass-roots practices. The need to consider multi-sitedness, particularly in institutional contexts, has also been acknowledged in the language ideology research. A focus on the sites where language ideologies are reproduced enhances understanding of the relationship between social structures, power and language (Rosa & Burdick, 2017). In the field of language policy ethnography, Teresa McCarty (2004) highlights the understanding of policy as practised and characterises language policies as complex sociocultural processes mediated by power relations within which interaction, negotiation and production intertwine. In language policy ethnography, an analytical emphasis on spaces and spatiality has been presented as enabling a more profound understanding of the interrelatedness of macro-level language policies and micro-level language practices (Hornberger and Johnson 2010; McCarty 2015). While recognising this potential, this study also aims to utilise the spatial approach for deconstructing the analytical division between macro and micro dimensions in language policy studies. Therefore, the post-structuralist understandings of the operation of power in language policy processes become essential.

Any study of language is inevitably also a study of power with regard to the recognition and distribution of linguistic resources in society (Blackledge & Creese, 2012; Heller & Martin-Jones, 2001). In critical language policy studies, *power* is a central concept, which refers to the ability to control events in order to achieve one's aims. Thus, language policy is considered as a mechanism for the state and other policy-making institutions to practice power (Tollefson, 2006). However, aligned with critical language policy studies and the ethnographic paradigm, the present study places a particular emphasis on power and individual agency. Therefore, language policies in the current dissertation are not only considered as top-down policies but comply with an understanding of multi-sitedness that facilitates shaping the practices in the everyday spaces of educational institutions. The intensity of language policy processes in terms of power cannot be captured merely by looking at state-driven policies and governance, since power circulates in micro-level discourses and practices (Johnson & Johnson,

2015). Observing how language and other policies play out in the everyday practices within institutions enables a more comprehensive understanding of the reproduction of and resistance to state regulation (Martín Rojo, 2017). However, considering power as spread out in multiple spaces and relations does not insist that everyone has the same opportunities to shape those processes.

García, Flores and Spotti (2017) locate the interest of post-structuralist language studies in the interrelations between language practices and the socio-historical, political and economic conditions that produce them. The aim of disrupting modernist conceptualisations of language as bounded entities and unveiling the power relations that participate in the construction of linguistic norms is central (Makoni & Pennycook, 2007). Pennycook (2010) states that all views on language, that is, language ideologies, are located in particular histories and articulated from certain perspectives. Therefore, language can be viewed as local practice, as a form of action in a specific time and place. These practices can be considered as actions with a particular history and viewed as examples of how language operates as a social and spatial activity. Corson (2001) suggests that language should be understood as a vehicle for identifying, manipulating, and changing power relations between people. Within a post-structuralist framework, power is understood as exercised in social encounters instead of being possessed by particular actors. By implication, the questions of how language produces particular subject positions, what consequences they have and what people do in order to negotiate and resist them, are crucial (García, Flores & Spotti, 2017). Power is not concentrated in a single place or exercised in a single direction but is at once both hidden and present. Thus, research should focus on the multiple relations and social encounters in which power is exercised (Martín Rojo, 2017). Moreover, power is not only repressive or destructive but also productive; it produces knowledge (Martín Rojo, 2017; Heller, 2011). The link between power and knowledge can be considered as particularly central in the study of language policies in educational systems of nation-states. The management of power relations can be identified as taking place in everyday encounters. For instance, linguistic normalisation can be seen as a technology of power, which operates through such categorisations and labels as order and disorder, differentiation and integration. The monolingual norm as well as the standardisation and separation of different languages in school institutions can be considered as manifestations of linguistic normalisation (Martín Rojo, 2017). In this study, the operation of power in language policy processes through normalisation, categorisation and differentiation is also viewed as having spatial implications.

Considering the relevance of power as a concept in a post-structuralist framework, the notion of *linguistic governance* can be considered as essential to every dimension of language policy in Spolsky's terms (2004): language ideology, language management and language practice. Walsh (2012) presents language gov-

ernance as an emerging conceptual framework for analysing the multi-layered nature of language policy, pointing out that a variety of terms have been utilized in the attempts to influence language behaviour or attitudes. By employing this particular concept, Grin and Schwob (2002) define the aim of language policy as to direct society's linguistic environment towards a more desirable state. In a post-structuralist framework, the indirect acts of governing that shape individual and group language behaviour can also be termed as linguistic governmentality (Pennycook, 2002; Tollefson, 2006). Instead of state-driven hegemony, the paradigm of governmentality stresses how power operates among micro-level practices and discourses, making individuals behave as desired (Johnson & Johnson, 2015). Despite the presumed power relations in various linguistic domains, the aims of language policy planning are far from unambiguous; they can be seen as promoting monolingualism in favour of dominant languages as much as supporting the use of minority languages (Walsh, 2012). Therefore, language policies should also be considered as a means of control, even if the rhetoric of present language policies promoting multilingualism is typically associated with the concepts of social justice and diversity.

From a language ideological point of view, the aims of linguistic governance can roughly be defined as balancing between promoting linguistic diversity and safeguarding national or cultural unity (cf. Milani, 2007). The *orientations* towards languages and their roles in society are embedded in the aims and ideals of linguistic governance. Ruiz (1984) has distinguished between these orientations as viewing language as a problem, a right, and a resource. The resource orientation is manifested for example in contemporary discourses on bilingual education and competitiveness, where language is seen as an individual skill or a commodity without a connection to one's background or identity (see da Silva, McLaughlin & Richards, 2007; Nikula et al., 2012) but also in discourses emphasising language as a cultural resource for identity construction and communication (see Hult & Hornberger, 2016; Vuorsola, 2019). Since language policy orientations constitute the discursive space in which the attitudes towards language are formed, they can be considered as discourses about language, which define the rationalities and what can be considered as thinkable about language in society. Language policy orientations thus contribute to the construction of value hierarchies between languages. Manan, David and Dumanig (2016) present these orientations as related to micro-level language governance and management in school space. Moreover, the orientations can be understood as an analytical tool for distinguishing values underlying policy-making and emerging from multi-voiced language policy debates. They provide a framework for analysing both explicit and implicit policies on different scales of space and time (Hult & Hornberger, 2016).

Emphasis on language policy *agency*, i.e., the role of individuals and collectives in the processes of language policies is characteristic of the critical and post-structuralist approaches to language policy research (Ricento, 2000). This implies,

both a focus on the operation of power and the available subject positions for the members of communities and on how new subject positions are being created through the resistance to the dominant power relations. While recognising the power of language policy in shaping educational spaces, the ethnographic perspective of this study highlights the agency of the teaching staff and pupils in shaping the spatial orders of schooling by negotiating and resisting the positions they are given (cf. Arnesen, Lahelma, Lundahl & Öhrn, 2010; McCarty, 2015; Bergroth & Palviainen, 2017; Menken & García 2010; Hornberger & Johnson 2011). Therefore, the question of structure and agency becomes central in ethnographic analysis and even more so in conducting policy-oriented ethnographic research. As Beach (2011, 572) puts it, the understanding of agency in ethnographic research entails an “emphasis on an active and creative human citizen and an assumption that there is a dialectical relationship between human social practices, human consciousness and social structures.” However, while identifying the spaces and opportunities for individual agency in educational language policy processes, the power of policy discourses should be taken seriously (Johnson, 2017). The opportunities for individuals to challenge and modify social and institutional orders have been stressed in critical ethnographic studies on language policies, while also acknowledging the constraints of action and recognising teachers and pupils as socially positioned (Martin-Jones & da Costa Cabral, 2018; Heller, 2006).

2.2 Spatial theorisations in analysing the operation of language policies in everyday schooling

This study aims to show how language policies shape the spatiality of social life in schools and how these encounters are negotiated. This premise is understood as comprehending both the meanings given to space by social actors, the ways in which these meanings contribute to the construction and appropriation of space and, finally, how these spatial practices are reflected back into the social construction of identities and categorisations (see also Valentine, 2001; Richardson & Jensen, 2003). Furthermore, it encompasses the notion that instead of merely reflecting each other, space and society are mutually constituted. Rather than constituting a mere frame for the practices of everyday life, the role of space in the constitution and reproduction of social identities is active (Valentine, 2001; de Certeau, 1984). Space is not simply a context or a background for social life but a central component in the exercise of power and political struggle (Kallio, 2005). The past three decades have introduced and established a spatial turn, i.e., an increasing interest in the analysis of space in the social sciences. The interest in the spatiality of social processes has influenced both educational research (e.g. Gulson & Symes, 2007; Butler & Sinclair, 2020) and the study of language and society (e.g. Blommaert, 2013; Brown, 2013). The significance of a spatial understanding in

the study of educational justice has also been pointed out in several studies in the Nordic countries and beyond (e.g. Kosunen, 2016; Fjellman, 2019; Beach, From, Johansson & Öhrn, 2018). However, the studies on spatial justice in education mostly embrace a macro perspective in how they underline the geographical dimensions of power as a spatial issue. By employing a spatial analysis, I wish to expand a similar perspective on everyday practices and discourses of education. Therefore, the construction of linguistic categories, boundaries and hierarchies in this study are understood as spatial processes; as operating and being manifested through the use and conceptualisation of space in daily discourses and practices of education.

Ever since the notion of space began to emerge in the social sciences, there has been a simultaneous critique of the vague use and shallow definitions of the concept and related ideas (Lefebvre, 1991; Massey, 2005). In addition to its geometrical and geographical qualities, space and spatiality have been given new kinds of mental and social connotations, particularly influenced by the work of the French philosopher and sociologist Henry Lefebvre. In particular, Lefebvre (1991) conceptualised space and spatiality through a Marxist analysis of the reproduction of social relations in a capitalist society. Lefebvre's ideas have been further applied and developed in a large body of research outside the Marxist paradigm, including education and linguistics (e.g. Gordon, Holland and Lahelma, 2000; Hadi-Tabassum, 2006). In particular, his conceptualisation of space as continuously reproduced as physical, social and mental has been influential for many ethnographers. In this study, too, space is conceptualised as three-dimensional, these dimensions overlapping and intertwining and continuously being reconstructed through discourse and practice (Lefebvre, 1991).

Space is always already caught up in representational practices, with different groups vying for control of discourses about space, but also of the messages which are coded in spatial artefacts themselves. (- -) "Representations of space" controlled by powerful elites in society may be contested by subaltern space users who attempt to make out of them "spaces of representation" (Lefebvre *ibid.*, 33, 38-39).

Furthermore, the specification of space by Lefebvre (*ibid.*, 33) as conceived, practised and lived has been influential for the understanding of spatiality in this study, particularly through the application of the concepts in Samina Hadi-Tabassum's (2006) critical ethnography of a bilingual classroom. *Conceived space* refers to the representations and conceptualisations of space constructed and reconstructed in educational discourse. These representations and conceptualisations are embedded in policies, plans and schemes that aim to generate an ideal spatial and temporal order. According to Hadi-Tabassum (*ibid.*, 67), spatial conceptualisations contribute to the creation of the social and political identity and the value of a

particular space. In this study, conceived space is approached specifically through interviews with educators, policy discourse and media texts. It is considered as a vital component of the spatial ideologies in education and for analysing the meanings given to space in the language policy discourse in educational contexts. Moreover, I argue that the representations and conceptualisations of space form a basis for the spatial materialisation of language boundaries in school through the discursive struggles they entail.

Space as practised, or spatial practice, stands for the physical qualities of space and the reproduction of everyday spatial routines in schools. In this study, I consider this dimension of space as essentially related to the material qualities of space and how they shape the everyday practices in schools. It is possible to draw a parallel with what Gordon and others (2000) have termed *spatial praxis*, meaning the processes in which the physical spaces of the school become social while teachers organise and re-organise their use. Spatial praxis entails a reciprocal dynamic through which the spatial shapes the social and mental and is itself shaped. In addition to providing a context for educational practices and processes, the physical space of the school also shapes these practices and processes by offering opportunities and limitations for agency, thus contributing to producing differentiation between pupils. Consequently, Gordon and others (ibid.) introduce the concept of *time-space paths* to describe the manifestations of spatial and temporal control in schools and for the ways in which physical space is socially organised for use, which they describe as time-space paths, as manifestations of spatial and temporal control in schools. The way I see the interrelations between these concepts and apply them in my analysis is that spatial practice, spatial praxis and time-space paths all entail a dimension of power being manifest as spatial control, taking place in the encounters between the material and social.

Finally, *lived space* in this study stands for spatial agency. It can be understood as the appropriation and creation of new kinds of space and particularly the negotiation and resistance of language related spatial control. For example, Kirsi Paulina Kallio (2005) has highlighted that even in the context of the spatial governance directed towards children in educational institutions and elsewhere in the society, the possibilities embedded in children's agency to counter this control should be considered just as remarkable. The lived spaces are produced in the encounters between the material and the social, in how the spaces shape their users and vice versa (Saarikangas, 2002). Considering the potential for agency in the lived spaces, they can be seen as territories of resistance, where the ideals, plans and representations of particular use of space are also questioned and re-formulated (see also Hadi-Tabassum, 2006; Lefebvre, 1991).

Doreen Massey's notions of space have also been influential in the recent studies of the spatiality of social life and for this particular dissertation. Particularly in her later works, she focuses on drafting a spatial philosophy, in which she distinguishes three propositions with regard to the definitions of space. Through these

propositions, Massey (2005) describes space as the product of interrelations; the sphere of coexisting heterogeneity and plurality, always under construction, and open and in the process of being made. In Massey's thinking, the spatial is always considered in relation to the political. She argues that "thinking the spatial in a particular way can shake up the manner in which certain political questions are formulated" (Massey, *ibid*, 9). Pink (2015) also points out that Massey's work enables the understanding of space and place through the politics of space. The inclusion of a spatial dimension can contribute to the construction of imaginative structures that enable new ways of opening up the political. Thus, to Massey, understanding space as a product of interrelations is also resistance to the essentialisation of identities and instead directs the gaze towards the construction of political subjectivities and a relational understanding of the world. The recognition of spatiality encompasses the potential for the recognition of multiplicity and heterogeneity. Instead of being a container for fixed identities, a space is always open to constant re-articulations of its meanings and relations to other spaces. Language-related identities within a nation-state, such as the categorisation of native speakers, speakers of national minority languages and other minority language speakers, are specifically spatial but can be reconceptualised relationally (Massey, 2005). In spatial terms, the potential to imagine "a somewhere else" can enable challenging social categories as fixed and as accepting the complexity of identification (Valentine, 2001, 6). The chance of thinking differently entails the possibility to deconstruct the dualisms that have structured geographical analyses of space (such as centre – margin, urban – rural) and enables new ways of analysing it. In the debates contributing to the spatial turn in social sciences, such alternative conceptualisations of space have also been termed as *third space* (Soja, 1996), *paradoxical space* (Rose, 1993) and *hybrid space* (Bhabha, 1994).

In addition to the interrelationality, political nature, and plurality of space prominent in Massey's thinking, her conceptualisations of place have been influential in the social sciences. The relationship between space and identity becomes tangible in the process of place-making. Space as a neutral, abstract concept becomes a subjective place, when it gains meanings in the lifeworld (Kortelainen, 2013; Haarni, Karvinen, Koskela & Tani, 1997). In critical cultural geography, places have been defined as spatio-temporal events (Massey, 2005). They are not isolated and bounded entities but through their relations to other places already contain "the other" to start with (Harvey, 1996). Following a similar understanding of place as not static but relational, Casey (2013) defines place as a continuous process and constantly subject to redefinition. Massey (2005) refers to the togetherness of place as the idea that places have both human and material qualities. Despite their interrelatedness with other places, the construction of boundaries around spaces can be considered essential in the continuous processes of place-making. Revisiting Doreen Massey's thinking, Elina Paju (2013) reminds

us that boundaries can be drawn around geographical and institutional spaces. Rituals of place-making are mundane practices carried out through the appropriation of space and places can be understood as locations mediated by bodily, ritual and linguistic practices (Gal, 2010; de Certeau, 1984). Approaching the material context of this study, Katarina Gustafson (2006) and Maria Rönnlund (2014) have pointed out the significance and special nature of the schoolyard as a space for identity construction through place-making in school institutions.

The compartmentalisation of children in institutions can be considered as a starting-point for spatial management in education (Gordon et al. 2000; Kallio, 2005; Valentine, 2001). Thomas Ricento (2006) describes schools as sites where language policies determine the languages to be used and participate in the construction of linguistic hierarchies where languages are categorised as good or bad, and acceptable or unacceptable. The ideological premise of this governance remains a premise of language separation, not only in monolingual institutions but also in bilingual education (see Cenoz & Gorter, 2017; Musk, 2010). As a spatial construct, an institution always has both abstract and material qualities and often significance as a social space as well. Institutions are constructed in the encounters between physical and mental space. Thus, the school as an institutional space is not merely material, imagined or representational but a combination of all these. Philo and Parr (2000) refer to institutions as particular types of space, whose intention is to control and improve bodies and minds. Thus, institutions such as schools are designed to achieve particular ends. School institutions as spatial constructs bring together the ideals presented through language and education policies as well as the physical qualities through which these ideals are best seen as to be practised. Thrift (2006) deploys the concept of performative architecture to refer to the connections between the school design and the learning that is planned to take place there. The ways in which physical spaces in educational institutions are being used not only imply governance and control through spatial policies but also reveal the hierarchies between the adults and the children (Paju, 2013). To Burkitt (2004), institutions represent attempts to fix social practice in time and space. As spaces, however, institutions are not fixed but both sustained and transformed through practice and redefined through negotiation.

The division into official and informal school is a feasible approach to analysing the spatiality of school life (Gordon, Hynninen, Lahelma, Metso, Palmu & Tolonen, 2006). While the adult-controlled official school is organised through timetables, curricula and a spatial segregation by age, there is a more informal world centred around the children's culture and their social networks. The use of space in educational institutions is largely controlled by the adults, and thus the children experience their school buildings differently from the educators (Delamont, 2014; Gordon et al. 2000; Valentine, 2001). Here, the distinction between official and informal school spaces becomes central, as well the potential for agency in these spaces. In this dissertation, however, the division between the

official and the informal school is not considered as clear-cut or unambiguous, but as temporally and spatially overlapping, and mutually constructed with adults and children possessing agency in all kinds of socio-spatial structures.

Drawing from these specific theories and concepts informed by critical post-structural language studies and spatial theorisation in social sciences, I have argued for a deeper understanding of language policies in education through the management of space through discourse and practice. This particular framework focuses on the operation of power through spatial representations, conceptualisations and spatial practices and provides a means of looking at language policies as negotiations of space in a mental and physical sense in this dissertation. I will now proceed to present the context and background of the study.

3 CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The educational and language policy contexts of this study are the official bilingualism and Swedish-medium education in Finland as well as education for the Finnish-speaking national minority in Sweden. Despite the intertwined histories of Finland and Sweden, Finland having been a part of the Swedish kingdom for over 600 years until 1809, the language policies in both countries have taken different historical turns and taken on different configurations (see Boyd & Huss, 2001; Halonen, Ihalainen & Saarinen, 2015). This section provides an overview of the development and the present state of the educational language policies regarding the bilingualism of Finland and the position of Finnish in Sweden by integrating previous research conducted on the topic. Moreover, the configuration of co-located Finnish- and Swedish-speaking schools in Finland and bilingual Sweden Finnish schools in Sweden is presented as a backdrop to the spatial approach of this study

3.1 Swedish in the language policies and education system of Finland

Finland is an officially bilingual country with its two national languages, Finnish and Swedish. The present language policy status of Swedish derives from the period in history when Finland was a part of the Swedish kingdom, until the year 1809. Swedish inhabitants started spreading out to the Finnish peninsula during the 12th and 13th centuries, settling mostly in the coastal areas. Today, the Swedish-speaking population is still mainly concentrated along the coastline and in the country's biggest cities, such as Helsinki, Turku and Tampere (Engman, 1995; Saukkonen, 2013; Salo, 2012). Even during the years under Russian rule, from 1809 until Finnish independence in 1917, Swedish was the political, cultural and formal language of Finland. Swedish maintained its central position in Finland despite the national movement of the 19th century, which promoted the Finnish language as a means of nation-building. The equal status of the two national languages has been guaranteed in legislation since the first Language Act in 1922. (Henning-Lindblom, 2012; Latomaa & Nuolijärvi, 2005; Latvalehto, 2018). At present, Swedish is the mother tongue for 5.3 percent of the population and Finnish for 88.7 percent (OSF, 2017). Even today the Swedish-speaking Finns are well represented as a minority group in Finnish society in terms of cultural capital and political influence (Henning-Lindblom, 2012; McRae, 2007; Saarela & Finnäs, 2004). However, issues related to Swedish as the second national language and

Swedish-speaking institutions have remained a source of controversy within language political debates, despite bilingualism being a constitutive principle of the nation since Finnish independence, particularly in recent years and since the rise of Finnish nationalist tendencies, reflected in general debate and such things as the agenda of the Finns political party (Ihalainen & Saarinen, 2015; Hult & Pietikäinen, 2014). Apart from the national languages, the Finnish Constitution recognises linguistic rights in relation to the Sámi languages, Romani and sign language. However, these are not designated as official minority languages in Finnish legislation, nor are the established Russian, Tatar and Jewish groups granted any specific language policy status (Latomaa & Nuolijärvi, 2005; Laihonon & Halonen, 2019).

In Finland, comprehensive education is to be organised separately for both national languages, as formulated in the following excerpt from Finnish Basic Education Act.

The local authority in a municipality which has both Finnish and Swedish-speaking residents shall be responsible for arranging basic and pre-primary education *separately for both linguistic groups*. (Basic Education Act, 628/1998, 4§, amendment 1288/1999, my italics)

The language of instruction and the language used in extracurricular teaching shall be *either Finnish or Swedish*. The language of instruction may also be Saami, Roma or sign language. In addition, part [*sic*] of teaching may be given in a language other than the pupils' native language referred to above, provided that this does not risk the pupils' ability to follow teaching. (Basic Education Act, 10§, 628/1998, amendment 1288/1999, my italics)

These formulations of the Basic Education Act have in practice been interpreted as legitimizing the monolingualism of Swedish-speaking schools in general, not merely in relation to the Finnish language. They participate in the construction of a discourse, in which monolingual schools are seen as crucial for the smaller of the national languages remaining vital (Sahlström, From & Slotte-Lüttge, 2013; Boyd & Palviainen, 2015). Interestingly, while the legislative requirement of linguistic separation of the national languages does not apply to upper secondary education, high schools are nevertheless monolingually Finnish or Swedish. Bilingual Finnish- and Swedish-speaking institutions are recognised in the legislation concerning vocational education (From & Sahlström, 2019). Furthermore, the

educational administrations of bilingual municipalities in Finland are required to set up separate sections in Finnish and Swedish.²

Bilingual municipalities shall set up a separate decision-making body for the administration of education for each language group, or a joint decision-making body divided into sub-committees for the language groups. The members of the decision-making body or sub-committee must be elected from among persons who are part of the language group in question. (Local Government Act 410/2015, 30§).

The institutional separation of the national languages penetrates society from the governmental level to educational institutions. Finnish state bilingualism and its educational consequences might be described as a manifestation of what Heller (2006, 5) has conceptualised as *parallel monolingualisms*, which refers to multilingualism as being constituted of sets of autonomous monolingual entities rather than a hybrid intended to deconstruct the ideological and social boundaries between languages. Events in Finnish history have meant that the position of Swedish and the cultural autonomy of the Swedish-speaking population has always been a somewhat controversial topic in the Finnish societal debate (e.g. Ihalainen & Saarinen, 2015). In recent years, the language controversies have culminated in questions of the obligatoriness of studying Swedish in the less Swedish-speaking regions of Finland as well (Salo, 2012; Saukkonen, 2013).

The past decade has been witnessing a number of political and societal debates related to the national languages and education in Finland. Many of these discussions have touched upon the issue of space both in a metaphorical sense and as a material construct. In these debates, the institutional monolingualism of Swedish-speaking schools has frequently been insisted upon (Slotte-Lüttge, From & Sahlström, 2013; Boyd & Palviainen, 2015; From & Sahlström, 2019). This discourse of language separation as a means for protecting the smaller of the national languages has also been reproduced in policy documents. For example, the Strategy for the National Languages of Finland declares that “a Swedish-language school cannot act as a language school because its task is to be an institution that passes on and creates Swedish language in Finland” (Tallroth, 2012, 14). Given this statement, it becomes possible to understand why proposals for bilingual educational solutions in Finnish and Swedish have been provoking debate. In 2009, the first critical debates on co-locating Swedish- and Finnish-speaking schools in same buildings began in the Finnish media. Back then, the major concern seemed to be the questioning of the Swedish-speaking schools as separate monolingual physical

² In 2017, 33 out of 311 municipalities in Finland were bilingual. The 16 monolingually Swedish municipalities were all located in the autonomous region of the Åland Islands (Local and Regional Government Finland, 2017).

spaces from the Finnish-speaking schools. The shared schoolyards in particular were seen as problematic places in this sense, since Finnish was believed to take over readily among the pupils in the Swedish-speaking schools outside the classrooms and curricular activities. Later on, starting in 2011, the discussion proceeded to consider actual bilingual schools, where instruction would be given in both national languages for both Finnish- and Swedish-speaking pupils in the same groups. This time, too, the same potential threats to the minority language as before were highlighted and an understanding of the necessity to frame a monolingual space was often involved in the argumentation against bilingual schools (see Boyd & Palviainen, 2015; Slotte-Lüttge, From & Sahlström, 2013; Sundman, 2013).

In the present day, individual plans to establish new co-located campuses are primarily discussed by local media, but similar nationwide attention is seldom gained through the plans for bilingual solutions (see From & Sahlström, 2019). This development shows how the discourse about language and school space is changing, and how the understanding of thinkable ways of organising Swedish-speaking education has broadened in the past decade. During the debates of the past ten years, the spatial separation of Finland's national languages in institutional education has been questioned in an exceptional manner. Among the criticism for the potential threats entailed by co-located and bilingual schools, those voices supporting and calling for bilingual solutions have also begun to be amplified (Boyd & Palviainen, 2015; Slotte-Lüttge, From & Sahlström, 2013). The tone of the discussions of co-located and bilingual schools has been shifting regionally. In the more Swedish-speaking parts of the country, such as the western coast of Finland, bilingual solutions have been introduced as more realisable visions, since the linguistic power relations in the community outside school have been considered to provide more support for Swedish than, for example, in the capital region or in the so-called Swedish-speaking *language islands* of Finland,³ where the Swedish-speaking population is relatively small. In relation to the legislative requirement of separation of the national languages in comprehensive education, the most "radical" views and arrangements are typically found and considered safer in regions where the Swedish-speaking population forms a local majority. Thus, it is justified to consider these debates in their socio-linguistic and socio-historical contexts, as being shaped in particular spatial circumstances.

However, at the same time as the number of co-located schools is increasing, the initiatives for bilingual schools providing instruction in Finnish and Swedish are still pending. So far, bilingual instruction in the national languages is provided

³ In this context, the concept of language island means the presence of Swedish-speaking populations in administratively Finnish-speaking municipalities, in which the position of Swedish is both historical and supported by a Swedish-speaking infrastructure, such as educational institutions. Examples of such language islands are Tampere, Oulu and Kotka (Laurent, 2013; Lönnroth, 2009).

in language immersion programs in selective classes of municipal schools, the availability of which varies regionally (Sjöberg, Mård-Miettinen, Peltoniemi & Skinnari, 2018). These classes are primarily aimed at Finnish-speaking children with no proficiency in the other national language. The only municipality in Finland where language immersion is provided in both national languages in the same school facilities – yet in separate classrooms in Finnish and Swedish – is the city of Jakobstad where a majority of the population speak Swedish as their mother tongue (see Språkbudsskolan, 2020; Löf, 2020). Moreover, the best developed plan for a bilingual school in the capital area has been the case of a Nordic school, collaboration between the Finnish- and Swedish-speaking municipal school administrations in Helsinki. The plan is to set up a language immersion model, which also aims to provide instruction in other Nordic languages (City of Helsinki, 2019; Lindberg, 2019). However, the current plan seems to reflect primarily the idea of Swedish as a resource reproduced in the discourses of Nordic citizenship and collaboration for Finnish speakers, instead of deconstructing the boundaries between the national languages by questioning the idea of two separate language groups.

3.2 Co-located schools as sites for negotiating the policy of language separation

Given the premise of spatial separation being manifest in language policy debates and institutions, *co-located schools* are a remarkable educational phenomenon. These are monolingual Finnish- and Swedish-speaking schools that are located in the same facilities, yet functioning as separate administrative units.⁴ Currently, there are approximately 35–45 schools located in shared campuses and the proposals to increase their number are being discussed by many bilingual regional administrations. In addition to the language policy controversy, the issue of co-locating schools can be also considered sensitive, since in some cases it has meant the merging of two smaller Swedish-medium schools to be co-located with an already existing Finnish-medium school. Thus, the practice also touches upon a broader development in the Swedish school network in Finland. Even if the core reasoning for co-located educational centres⁵ might be first and foremost economic, the pedagogical and language political reasoning is gaining a foothold in the planning phases of co-locations (From & Sahlström, 2019; Helakorpi et al., 2013; Sahlström et al., 2013; Kajander et al., 2015).

The body of research on the everyday practices in co-located schools in Finland is still limited, since their conceptualisation is a rather recent phenomenon, developing during the debate that started a decade ago. The ethnographic research conducted thus far has focused on co-located high schools and, in addition to the

⁴ Kieliparikoulut in Finnish, samlokaliserade skolor in Swedish.

⁵ Sivistyskeskus in Finnish, bildningscenter in Swedish.

similarities, has also been able to identify some special characteristics in practices and experiences between co-locations, which seem to be related to organisational cultures as well as other local conditions, such as the power relations between languages in a particular geographical region (see Sahlström, From & Slotte-Lüttge, 2013, Kajander et al., 2015). In the research conducted on co-located schools thus far, the issue of school space, in a symbolic and material sense, has provided a backdrop for many of the findings. On the one hand, the understanding of institutional education as the provider of a Swedish-speaking space in Finland has emerged particularly among the teaching staff of the Swedish-speaking schools. On the other hand, practical issues related to the mutual physical spaces, their appropriation and organisation seem to be stirring up argument in many of the campuses studied. Alongside the reserved attitudes towards sharing premises in both language groups and fears of linguistic decay through the loss of monolingual space among the Swedish-speakers, high expectations have also been placed on co-operation before the establishment of co-located campuses. Among pupils, students and staff members, the expectations concerning co-operation are not often fulfilled by the mutual school life in a co-located campus. The lack of resources has been offered as a central reason but the understanding of a need for monolingual space in the Swedish-speaking schools has also been seen as having an impact on the educational practices of co-located campuses, particularly by the staff in Swedish- and Finnish-speaking schools. (Helakorpi et al., 2013; Kajander et al., *ibid.*). Previous studies of language and identity construction in Swedish-speaking schools have pointed out the importance of historical continuity and traditions in relation to their perceived educational and pedagogical agenda (Mansikka, Holm & Londen, 2013; Kovero & Londen, 2009; Kovero, 2011). In the studies on co-located schools, the concern over the potential threat to this language-related agenda has been articulated only among the Swedish speakers (Kajander, et al., *ibid.*). However, no studies have been able to show that a co-location would affect the task of the Swedish-speaking schools in fostering language or cultural identity in a negative sense. At the same time, the social spaces in co-located schools still seem separated to a great extent to judge by the languages of the institution (Helakorpi et al., *ibid.*; Kajander et al., *ibid.*).

In their examination of teachers' language ideologies in a co-located high school campus, Szabó, Kajander, Alanen and Laihonen (2018) have described co-locations as sites for reconstructing monolingualism and native speakerism. However, the possibility of sharing linguistic and pedagogical resources across language boundaries is also starting to be recognised (Szabó et al., *ibid.*). Taken together, it is evident from the research conducted so far that co-located schools as a way of organising education question the premise of spatial separation as a material and social construct in many ways. The present study aims at a further analysis and understanding of the role of spatiality in this development.

3.3 Finnish in the language policies and education system of Sweden

The popular narratives, representations and cultural stereotypes of the Finnish minority in Sweden are often connected to post-war migration from Finland to Sweden. This migration accelerated after the second world war and reached its peak during the 1960s and 70s, when Finnish society was going through a structural change. Even if populations have been moving between the territories nowadays known as Finland and Sweden since the Viking Age, the social construction of Sweden Finnishness as a collective idea and an identity only began to take shape along with the migration (Latvalehto, 2018). However, as Latvalehto (*ibid.*) points out, the state-driven research on Sweden Finnishness during the post-war decades was typically centred on managing the Finnish immigration as a societal problem. Thereafter, questions of cultural identity particularly and the shift in experiences between generations have been at the core of the research conducted on Sweden Finnishness. In these representations and narratives of the Sweden Finnish minority, the social, historical and political developments of the status of Finnish in Swedish society play a significant part. Here, institutional education is one of the social and physical spaces in which these developments are reflected, and where national language and educational policies merge (see also Björklund, 2012; Henning-Lindblom, 2012; Korkiasaari & Tarkiainen, 2000; Latvalehto, 2018).

In various phases of the development of Swedish language policies, the promotion of language rights has been on the agenda of some of the national minorities, whereas the majority society has typically adopted a critical attitude towards their demands, since they have been considered as questioning the aim of equal treatment for all in a democratic welfare state (Boyd & Huss, 2001). In 1992, following a unilateral declaration of ethnic and linguistic minority status by representatives of the Sweden Finnish minority, the discussion on the recognition of national minority rights in Sweden began to intensify. Along with the accession of Sweden to the European Union, the pressure to align with the EU policies on the protection of national minorities and minority languages started to emerge. Finally, in 1999, Sweden ratified the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages. Along with the ratification of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, Sweden recognised Finnish, Meänkieli, Romani Chib, Sami and Yiddish as national minority languages (Boyd & Huss, 2001; Council of Europe 2017).

The Finnish language, Lainio (2015) writes, has been subject to many ambivalent political and societal turns during its long historical presence in Sweden. These turns have also had an impact on the position of Finnish in institutional education in Sweden. Lainio (*ibid.*) points out that even if language policies were not the most central mechanism in implementing the social democratic ideology

of a homogeneous people's home (in Swedish *folkhemmet*), its core value of treating everyone in the same way was rather paradoxically manifested through assimilatory language policies during the construction of a modern welfare state from the 1930s to the early 1990s. Despite 'the monolingual habitus of Sweden' (Lainio, 2015) and strong status of Swedish as a building block of the Swedish nation-state throughout history, Swedish received its official status as the main language (*huvudspråk*) of the nation only in the Language Act of 2009. However, the position of Swedish as the national language of Sweden from the 16th century has never really been contested (Lindberg, 2007). Interestingly, this language policy reform can be interpreted as not only improving the status of the five national minority languages but at the same time strengthening the linguistic hierarchy of a nation-state (cf. Nikula et al., 2012). Nevertheless, the political re-evaluation of the national minorities, along with a widespread critical reconstruction of Sweden's past policies, has also brought about increased awareness of the Finns as a minority group in Sweden – as well as the assimilatory policies Finnish has been subject to (Lainio, 2015). In the present situation, in addition to the Swedish Language Act (2009:600), the National Minorities and Minority Languages Act (2009:724) and the Education Act (2010:800) have aimed at improving rights related to language and national minority status in institutional education (Henning-Lindblom 2012). In the Education Act, the linguistic hierarchy between national minority languages and "other mother tongues than Swedish" is formulated as follows.

A pupil who has a guardian with another mother tongue than Swedish shall be offered mother tongue instruction in the language in question if

1. the language is the pupil's daily language of interaction, and
2. the pupil has good proficiency in the language

A pupil who belongs to a national minority shall be offered mother tongue instruction in the pupil's national minority language (Swedish Education Act, 2010:800, 10§, mother tongue instruction, my translation).

Despite the commitments to minority policies and legislation, problems related to their fulfilment have repeatedly emerged in Sweden and been pointed out by researchers, national minority delegations and the Council of Europe, which is responsible for monitoring the international policies (Council of Europe 2015; 2017; Huss, 2016; Syrjänen Schaal, 2013). These obstacles are related to the availability of mother tongue instruction in particular and the promotion of bilingualism in education in a more general sense. In the context of bilingual Sami schools, Bel-

ancic and Lindgren (2017) point out the tendency of the Swedish language education system to encourage functional bilingualism through legislation but not fully support it in educational practice among minority children. Moreover, Belancic and Lindgren (ibid.) interpret this tendency as a sign of structural discrimination. Similar challenges in the context of Finnish language education in Sweden have repeatedly been pointed out; the present system of mother tongue provision is not capable of providing the children with functional bilingualism (Lainio, 2017; Syrjänen Schaal, 2013; Vallius, Syrjänen Schaal & Teilus, 2005). The necessity of bilingual education, compared to curricular mother tongue instruction, in order for the children from language minorities to achieve or maintain functional bilingualism in a majority society has also been stressed in international studies (see Baker, 2017; García, 2008). In terms of mother tongue instruction and bilingual education, the insufficient teacher education in national minority languages in Swedish universities seems to be one of the shortcomings in finding qualified teaching staff and affecting the societal status of Finnish in general (Lainio, 2017; Hyltenstam & Milani, 2004). In an exhaustive governmental report from 2017, professor Jarmo Lainio both pinpointed the failings in the realisation of linguistic rights in education and submitted suggestions for statutory amendments to improve the situation. For instance, the report suggests a more distinct division between the provision of mother tongue instruction and instruction in the national minority languages in the legislation, in order to emphasise the need for and means of the revitalisation of the latter. In terms of bilingual education, a significant expansion in the delivery of bilingual education in the national minority languages was suggested (Lainio, 2017).

Regarding the specific language policy issues related to the status of Finnish, Sweden has responded to the criticism by stating that the interest in mother tongue instruction and bilingual education has decreased, since Finnish is not considered to be useful among the so-called second and third generation of Sweden Finns (Hyltenstam & Milani, 2004). This, however, can and should be interpreted as a political issue related the societal value of Finnish in Sweden instead of an issue of individual choice and interest (see also Muhonen, 2013; also discussed in Article II). The availability of bilingual education in Finnish and Swedish is also an issue of spatial justice in a geographical sense, not just regarding the linguistic differentiation taking place in everyday schooling. There are administrative districts (in Swedish *förvaltningsområden*) for the territorial minority languages Finnish, Meänkieli and Sami. Some municipalities have applied for administrative district memberships and been granted state funding for providing local municipality services in the minority language in question. A fifth of municipalities in Sweden are included in the Finnish administrative district and are thus required to provide local municipality services in Finnish. Above all, these requirements concern early childhood education and elderly care, whereas rights related to compulsory education are marginalised in the system of the administrative districts. There

are some differences in relation to the availability and amount of mother tongue instruction depending on whether the municipality is part of the administrative area or not. However, belonging to an administrative district does not impact the availability of bilingual education in that particular area (County Administrative Board of Stockholm & Sami Parliament, 2016).

Despite the ideological and political shift in the recognition of diversity, the idea of Sweden as still culturally homogeneous and monolingual to some extent remains among the majority population. The monolingual norm is deeply rooted for instance in the negative attitudes towards mother tongue instruction in languages other than Swedish (Lindberg, 2007). Moreover, the categorisation by the Education Department of Sweden (*Skolverket*) of non-native Swedish-speakers (in Swedish *icke infödda modersmålsvenskar*) and those speakers of Swedish who were born in Sweden has been criticised for maintaining structural discrimination and a dichotomy between “immigrant pupils” and “Swedish pupils”, even if these terms are no longer part of the official discourse (Siekkinen, 2017; Lorenz, 2013). Lainio (2015) argues that contemporary Swedish language policies are based on a new kind of understanding of the diverse history of Sweden, instead of the previous images of the monolingual and monocultural habitus and self-understanding. However, the shift towards positive views on language diversity has been present in the rhetoric but not in everyday social practices (Lainio, *ibid.*). This kind of rhetorical shift in language policy and planning has in other contexts also been interpreted as new forms of neo-liberal governance (Cardinal & Denault, 2007). Today, there remains a conflict between the minority policies promoting the cultural and linguistic heritage of the national minorities and the integration of the immigrants through policies that emphasise learning Swedish and Swedish “cultural values” (Lainio, 2015).

3.4 Fostering the access to bilingual education in independent Sweden Finnish schools

In education, the historical development of the policies and ideologies regarding linguistic diversity in Sweden can be illustrated through questions related to mother tongue instruction and bilingual education in the case of Finnish and minority languages in general. Following a long period of assimilatory and nationalist policies with regard to language and nation-building, the 1970s brought about more tolerant attitudes to linguistic diversity, including the recognition of the variation in pupils’ mother tongues in education (Boyd & Huss, 2001; Lainio, 2015). Lainio (*ibid.*) sees this policy shift as a combination of ideological and practical reasoning. First, the change was enabled through the questioning of assimilation as a policy; secondly, new understandings of language learning started to emerge simultaneously and, finally, there was a need to discover practices that helped the schools to cope with the growing number of children who did not speak Swedish.

Until then, the predominant policy had basically been to prohibit and even punish children for using languages other than Swedish in school. The Home Language Reform of 1977 obliged the municipalities to grant mother tongue provision for those willing to participate (Lindberg, 2007; Tuomela & Hyltenstam, 1996). This development towards the recognition of linguistic diversity also resulted in the establishment of Finnish-medium home language classes in Swedish municipal schools. However, this period was quite short since the disbanding of the home language classes began towards the end of 1980s. In the debates preceding the disbanding, home language classes were seen as a potential threat to social cohesion by contributing to isolation from mainstream society (Lainio, 2015).

The representatives of the Sweden Finns as a political group have been particularly active in the struggle for linguistic and educational rights in many instances in history. The aim of establishing bilingual education has been one of these struggles that first took place in the late 60s (Korkiasaari & Tarkiainen, 2000; Lainio, 2015). In these historical struggles for the achievement of minority language rights in education, the broader development of educational policies in Sweden is also of major importance, albeit sometimes overlooked in research and public debate. The influence of marketisation and the consequences of neoliberal policies in education have been particularly tangible in Sweden since the early 1990s, along with several reforms aiming at decentralisation of the educational system, previously highly regulated by the state. The school reform of 1992 enabled the establishment of new independent schools, as others than municipal or governmental organisers of education were granted an opportunity for public financing. Along with the introduction of educational quasi-markets, a voucher system was put into operation and families were granted the right to free school choice. In other words, instead of municipalities placing all pupils within the same catchment area in same schools, parents could choose any school for their child. Independent schools, or free schools, established along the school reform, are run by a variety of for-profit and non-profit private actors, such as parents, companies, educational or other foundations or charitable organisations. Despite of being private providers of education, independent schools are fully tax-funded and state-financed, and have no right to charge fees (Alexiadou, Dovemark, Erixon-Arreman, Holm, Lundahl & Lundström, 2016; Fjellman, 2019; the Swedish National Agency for Education, 2014). Thus, it is important to distinguish between Swedish independent schools and what is referred to as private schools internationally. However, considering the marketisation of education, it is notable that at the moment a majority of independent schools in Sweden are owned by for-profit corporations. Moreover, the growth in the number of independent schools and the children attending them in Sweden can be described as extremely rapid. Independent schools follow the Swedish national curriculum and are licensed and monitored by the Swedish National Schools Inspectorate (Dovemark, Kosunen, Kauko, Magnúsdóttir, Hansen & Rasmussen, 2018; Gynne, Bagga-Gupta & Lainio, 2016; Lundahl, 2016).

The establishment of language profile programs was also facilitated along with the independent schools' reform of 1992 (Boyd, Huss & Öttesjö, 2017). Concerned about the availability of education in Finnish, some Sweden Finnish organisations and other actors started founding independent schools with a bilingual profile (Lainio, 2015; Gynne, et al., 2016). Today, the independent bilingual Sweden Finnish schools are primarily responsible for organising bilingual education in Finnish and Swedish. Pedagogical and linguistic practices are school-specific but generally based on the principle of a dual language model, where the academic content and literacy are taught in two languages (see e.g. Baker, 2017, 194). The preconditions for organising bilingual education in municipal and independent schools are outlined in the Swedish School Ordinance (2011:185) as follows.

For pupils with another language than Swedish as a daily language of interaction with one or more of the guardians, some of the instruction in grades 1–6 can be organised in this language. For pupils with Finnish as the language of interaction, such instruction can also be organised in grades 7–9 (Swedish School Ordinance, 2011:185, §12, my translation).

During the total time the pupil receives bilingual instruction according to §12, no more than half of the instruction is allowed to be given in the language of interaction. Instruction shall be planned in such a way that the instruction in Swedish gradually increases (Swedish School Ordinance, 2011:185, §13, my translation).

From the perspective of language governance, these formulations in the Swedish School Ordinance reflect a clear ideological preference for Swedish as the common national language that everyone primarily needs to learn. However, the formulations for Finnish are more flexible than for other national minority languages, as bilingual education can also be provided in lower secondary education. However, as Lundberg (2017) points out, the micro-level appropriation of the language legislation in schools and classrooms is not guaranteed. While observing the language ideologies and practices in a bilingual urban school in Sweden, she identified the prevailing monolingual norm and language separation as obstacles to functional bilingual education. Moreover, these obstacles can also manifest themselves as spatial and material. For example, in her study on bilingual education in Swedish Sign Language (SSL) and Swedish, Bagga-Gupta (2010) has found that the teaching of these language subjects typically takes place in different parts of the school campus and even the teachers responsible for SSL and Swedish have their offices separate from each other. She connects this to a reductionist and categorising discourse about bilingualism.

Despite the challenges related to the emergence of independent schools as a symptom of marketisation of education in Sweden, the Sweden Finnish independent schools have been considered essential in the maintenance of the Finnish language and the promotion of Sweden Finnish culture and identity in Swedish society (Lainio, 2015; Gynne et al., 2016). Gynne and others (2016, 337) describe Sweden Finnish independent schools as “successful symbols of the agency and resistance of the minority community to the policies and ideologies that brought about assimilation and language shift to Swedish in the municipal schools previously”. However, Muhonen (2013) has also pointed out that Sweden Finnish schools are sites for rather controversial language ideological negotiations, where many kinds of linguistic power relations intertwine. In the current education policy context, the task of Sweden Finnish independent schools as providers of education in one of the national minority languages in a market-oriented educational system while at the same time conforming to the conditions of school choice and competition, is challenging. In recent years, these difficulties have emerged in the number of the independent Sweden Finnish schools that have been terminated in various parts of Sweden (Lainio, 2017; Vuorsola, 2019). In 2019, there are only five Sweden Finnish independent schools left in the regions of Sweden. In addition to these schools, bilingual instruction in Finnish and Swedish is sporadically available in some Finnish mother-tongue classes (*finska modersmålsklasser*) in municipal schools in various parts of the country. However, as pointed out previously, the number of these classes has also decreased considerably (Hyltenstam & Milani, 2004).

This chapter has presented the focal points of this study in terms of language policies and institutional education in Finland and Sweden. These historical developments and present policies can be understood as providing the preconditions and framing the power relations in relation to which language policy negotiations take place in everyday education spaces. As such, they provide a framework for the ethnographic context of this study, introduced in the next chapter.

4 THE RESEARCH PROCESS

Ethnography is a situated and systemic way of seeing that aims to answer the question of “what is going on here and why?” (see Wolcott, 2008; McCarty, 2011; Heller, 2006). By posing these questions, ethnography traces the power relations and culturally situated meanings ascribed to mundane practices. Rather than merely a method of data production, ethnography is a way of conducting, understanding and considering research (Atkinson, 2017), or a way of seeing, looking and being (Wolcott, 2008; McCarty, 2015). As a research practice, ethnography defines every phase of the research project, from initial planning to data production and analysis. Moreover, these phases are not separate, chronological events, but accumulate and intertwine during the process of ethnographic knowledge construction (Martin-Jones & da Costa Cabral, 2018; McCarty, 2015).

The ethnographic approach of this study is particularly situated in the body of research conducted in the fields of critical educational ethnography (Beach, 2011; Delamont, 2014; Gordon et al. 2000; Rajander, 2010, Arnesen, Lahelma, Lundahl & Öhrn, 2014) as well as critical ethnographic accounts in sociolinguistics and language policy research (Heller, 2008; Martin-Jones, Andrews & Martin, 2017; Johnson, 2017). Both traditions have concentrated on the negotiation of policies and the operation of power relations in everyday educational discourses and practices. Critically informed educational ethnography seeks to contextualise the everyday educational practices and displays of agency in everyday schooling in wider patterns of educational policies and societal structures (Lahelma & Gordon, 2007; Troman, Jeffrey & Beach, 2006). In the context of educational ethnography, Arnesen and others (2014, 9) have pointed out the interest of critical ethnographers in “dimensions of difference that are infused with relations of power”. In critical studies of language, ethnography “can identify processes that produce the valuation of language and speakers and that regulate speakers’ access to the production, circulation and consumption of resources” (García, Flores & Spotti, 2017, 12). In this chapter, I shall describe the premises of and practices related to this dissertation as an ethnographic study.

4.1 The empirical settings for the articles of this dissertation

The data utilised in this dissertation consists of material produced in multiple contexts with regard to the research sites and the national and language policy contexts. Therefore, the ethnographic approach here can also be described as multi-sited (Marcus, 1995; Niemi, 2015) and cross-cultural (Lahelma & Gordon, 2010). Both of these positionings relate to the idea and definition of the “field” in this

study, which I consider as consisting of multiple physical sites, not imposed for reciprocal comparison but stretching and questioning the boundaries of such categorisations as language, culture, and nation, examining the circulation of meanings given to them (see Marcus, 1995, 96). The data in article I consists of video ethnographic recordings, interviews and newspaper material that was produced during the *Språkmöten* project (in English, ‘language encounters’), where I was working as a research assistant. The data analysed in articles II and III covers some of the ethnographic data that I produced during the ethnographic fieldwork for my doctoral dissertation. My position in these two projects has been rather different considering my influence on the research design and other decisions made during the research process. Thus, some of the ethnographic reflections in this chapter are more applicable to the data produced during the fieldwork for my dissertation, i.e., the ethnographic data produced solely by me for the empirical purposes of articles II and III.

Table 1. Data utilised in articles I, II and III.

	Article I	Articles II and III
Empirical data analysed	<p>127 contributions published in Finnish newspapers (2011–2014)</p> <p>Video recordings from a co-located high school campus in Finland (2011–2012)</p> <p>Interviews with staff in five co-located comprehensive school campuses in Finland (2012)</p>	<p>Ethnographic data (observations, interviews, photo-elicitation interviews) from a co-located primary school campus in Finland and a bilingual Sweden Finnish school in Sweden (2014–2015)</p>

Article I (From & Sahlström, 2017) makes use of some of the data produced during *Språkmöten*, a research project on co-located Finnish- and Swedish-speaking monolingual schools that share facilities with each other in Finland. The overall ethnographic interest of the project was to describe the language use changes of the students in these schools, particularly in terms of language choice and the orientation towards language and culture. This was done by conducting video recordings in one Finnish-speaking and one Swedish-speaking high school, which moved under the same roof in early 2012. The fieldwork was conducted in two one-week periods, the first of which was conducted prior to and the second one after the schools settled into the shared facilities (Sahlström, From & Slotte-Lüttge, 2013). In the course of the ethnographic fieldwork, I was one of the field researchers to participate in the recording of the material in both schools. Participatory video material was being generated in the project as well. The videos were produced by volunteer students, who were recording their lives outside school. During their school day, the same students were followed by researchers with

video cameras. As a research assistant, I was also responsible for the organisation, transcription and to some extent the analysis of the Finnish-speaking video recordings (see Sahlström, From & Slotte-Lüttge, 2013). Moreover, the interest of the project was to map and analyse the general attitudes and ideologies around the co-locations of Finnish- and Swedish-speaking schools in Finland at that time. This was done by conducting interviews with teaching staff in five co-located schools in different regions in Finland and analysing media debates on Finnish and Swedish bilingualism in education. These individual and group interviews were conducted by other project researchers during the autumn semester of 2012. The interviews were originally conducted in order to map the practices and experiences in co-located schools to be published in a report (Helakorpi et al. 2013). While I was going through the transcribed interviews, it became clear that there was a multitude of such views among the teaching staff, through which the representations or use of space were reflected upon in relation to language management or language policies in a broader sense. Moreover, a data set consisting of 127 contributions altogether in Finnish- and Swedish-speaking newspapers in Finland during 2011-2014 was collected during the project (see From, 2013; Slotte-Lüttge, From & Sahlström, 2013).

The data for Article I, consisting of transcripts of the video recordings, interview transcripts and newspaper contributions, were analysed using a post-structurally informed discourse-analytical reading, which emphasised the construction of certain rationalities in the discourses (see St. Pierre, 2000). Combined with this analytical approach, a theoretical framework informed by spatial theorisation was applied (Hadi-Tabassum, 2006; Richardson & Jensen, 2003). The variety of data enabled us to further explore how spatiality was present in multiple language policy dimensions, and in the discourses concerning Swedish-speaking education in Finland, both in public debates, the teachers' and students' talk and the everyday life of schools and how these dimensions become incorporated as something that can be scrutinised as *cultural space*. Even if the approach to doing ethnographic fieldwork and generating ethnographic data was rather different in *Språkmöten* from the fieldwork conducted for my own research purposes in 2014-2015, I consider the analysis as situated within a similar ethnographic paradigm. Our experience of being at the research sites and in contact with the students whose daily lives we were recording shaped our analytical gaze and contextualised our observations of the material utilised in Article I. The range of data enabled us to apply a spatial analytical approach to data we were familiar with, as well as for me specifically to plan and prepare the theoretical basis for the upcoming fieldwork for my doctoral research. Most significantly, Article I lays the groundwork and illuminates the results that also apply to articles II and III even if they take place in a different context and under different methodological premises.

Table 2. Timeline for data production for Article I.

2011	2012	2013	2014
Newspaper texts	Newspaper texts	Newspaper texts	Newspaper texts
	Interviews		
Video recordings	Video recordings		

Articles II (From & Holm, 2019) and III (From, 2020) draw from the ethnographic data produced during the fieldwork in one co-located campus of Finnish- and Swedish-speaking primary schools (Schools A and B) in Finland and in one Sweden Finnish bilingual school in Sweden (School C). This is also the basis for more profound methodological reflections in this dissertation, given that this time I was solely responsible for the research design and conducting the fieldwork. In the following sections, I shall provide these methodological considerations in relation to this ethnographic fieldwork conducted in Finland and Sweden during 2014 and 2015.

4.2 Ethnographic fieldwork

My aim as an ethnographer was to settle into the daily routines of the schools and to familiarise myself with the spatial and temporal practices in each. In comparison to other educational inquiries, Sara Delamont (2014) considers the physical presence of the researcher in the spaces and places of data production as distinctive to ethnographic methods, as they are essentially related to the participants' identities, sense of self and social world. Delamont (ibid.) also points out that the researcher then, by writing about those spaces, takes the readers there. As Silja Rajander notes, ethnography as a way of conducting research has a special relationship with space, the ethnographer "going, being, interrogating and writing about a particular *somewhere*" (Rajander, 2010, 36). Spatial thinking is also what enables us to connect the situated ethnographic knowledge produced in that particular *somewhere* to a wider frame. In this study, ethnography serves as a way of learning about spatial practices as well as the discourses that contribute to the construction of language-based social differences within institutional education. In critical accounts, ethnographic data and knowledge gain their explanatory power through being placed and observed in a wider political context (Lahelma & Gordon, 2007).

Table 3. Timeline for fieldwork for Articles II and III.

October 2014 – January 2015	March 2015 – April 2015	May 2015	November 2015
Schools A and B (Finland) Observations, inter- views with the staff and photo-elicitation with pupils	School C (Sweden) Observations, inter- views with the staff, photo-elicitation and feedback ses- sions/joint discussions with the pupils	Schools A and B (Finland) Observations and feedback ses- sions/joint discus- sions with the pupils	School C (Sweden) Observations

4.2.1 Negotiating entry

Among many educational ethnographers, Rajander (2010) perceives negotiating entry in the field as an on-going process through which the ethnographer gains the opportunity to access particular settings and engage in *conversations*, which she uses as a metaphor for the multifold and multi-sited discussions occurring in the research settings. She writes:

As a metaphor, I invoke conversation to emphasise commitment to dialogue that does not to *[sic]* imply an epistemological assumption of harmony or straightforward linearity, but one of connectedness of which resistance and daring are a part, as are negotiation and reflection (Rajander, 2010, 51).

In the context of my ethnographic field, I align with the idea of negotiation as an on-going process through the course of fieldwork, various occasions, and in relation to the power relations between the ethnographer and the participants (cf. Gordon et al., 2005). Moreover, I consider negotiation prior to, during, and after the fieldwork as building trust in a situation, where the present power relations could also potentially harm the participants. In the case of all three schools, the negotiations for entry were done separately but followed a similar pattern. I started negotiating access to the schools by contacting their principals by e-mail. In the message, I presented my research idea briefly and expressed my interest in conducting the related fieldwork in that particular school. Moreover, I attached a more comprehensive research plan as a separate file in the e-mail, for more detailed information on the theoretical and methodological foundations of my study. Being aware of the heavy workload of principals and the large number of daily e-mails in their inboxes, I also wrote that I would contact them by phone in a few days' time. In the following sections, I shall describe the contacts and negotiations that preceded the actual field period in all three schools.

In Finland, I had made an initial agreement on conducting fieldwork in a particular co-located primary school campus in the spring of 2014. However, while contacting the principal of the Swedish-speaking school before the end of the spring semester in May, they told me that they had, together with the principal of the Finnish-speaking school, decided to withdraw their participation after all. There were some upcoming changes on the campus and the principals felt that they had to minimise other potential disturbances to provide the teachers and pupils with stable working conditions. As I had not in any case planned to spend the entire academic year in the co-located school campus, the change in the original plan did not have critical consequences regarding my plan for data production. Moreover, at this point, I already had another co-located school in mind but I felt it was too late to start negotiations with them before the summer holidays. On contacting their principals in August, I received a positive response from both. Moreover, they put me in contact with Mikko, the 5th grade class teacher in the Finnish-speaking school, as well as with Fredrik, who was teaching the combined 5th and 6th grade class in the Swedish-speaking school.⁶ After having received an initial positive response from the schools, I contacted the educational administration of the municipality in question in order to inquire about their procedures concerning research agreements. As a bilingual municipality, this particular city had their educational administration divided into two monolingual departments, each led by their own directors. I was instructed to submit a written proposal to the directors including all the relevant information of my study, who would then decide on the matter. Folded in a single envelope, separate agreements for both the Swedish- and the Finnish-speaking schools, signed by the respective directors, later arrived by mail.

Together with the principals in both schools of the co-located campus, we agreed on an initial schedule to start the fieldwork in late October, right after the schools' autumn leave. We also agreed that I would visit the staff meetings in both schools some weeks ahead of the planned field period, to discuss my research plan and hear their thoughts about participation. The staff meetings in the Finnish- and Swedish-speaking schools took place during the same week but on different afternoons.

I first arrive at the co-located campus on a sunny September afternoon to attend the staff meeting of the Finnish-speaking school. I am feeling nervous about many things, even if according to the principal, my research initiative was given a positive reception among the teachers and assistants. The relaxed and laughter-filled atmosphere at the meeting confirms my preconception. As I present my research idea, the staff members are

⁶ Multigrade classes are typical in small schools, particularly in rural areas in Finland with a low number of pupils in each year (see Hyry-Beihammer & Hascher, 2015).

eager to ask questions and many of them express their interest in participating in the interviews. During the meeting, it turns out that some of the staff members live a bilingual family life and some even have their children in the Swedish-speaking school I am about to study. These people are pointed out as particularly suitable for interviews by other staff members, since “they have a lot to say about bilingual everyday life”. In the meeting I get the impression that even if no one seems to think about my presence in the school as a potential threat, my access to their everyday life is not considered to be unconditional.⁷ As they are willing to welcome me into their community, I am also expected to share details about myself and my background, both academic and personal. I do not mind doing this for the sake of mutual confidence but I am also aware that as a white middle class Finnish-speaking female living in a heterosexual relationship, it is relatively easy for me to respond to the call for openness (Research diary, September, 2014).

I returned to the campus a couple of days later, in order to attend the staff meeting of the Swedish-speaking school. This time I was nervous in particular since I had not been speaking Swedish actively for some months. Compared to the meeting in the Finnish-speaking school, I was now more prepared for how I wanted to phrase my research plan but also more dependent on the notes that I had brought with me. I had been invited to participate in the middle of the meeting, with other issues on the agenda before and after my visit. Because the school was smaller, the atmosphere in the meeting was calmer and more intimate than in the Finnish-speaking school. A great many language-related positioning and reflections occupied my thoughts during our first meeting and, in one way or another, these reflections followed me throughout the field period in the Swedish-speaking school.

Three staff members and the principal are gathered around a small round table in the staff room. Fredrik, the class teacher of my focus class is also present, with whom I have not yet managed to get in touch with regardless of my e-mails. I begin by saying that I will talk briefly, since I assume that my visit to the meeting is only one of the many points on the agenda today. I get nods of approval. I say a little something about myself and my background, my research principles and about the fieldwork in practice. Since I have not yet had a chance to talk with Fredrik, I am using the co-operation with the Finnish-speaking focus class as an example. A lot of my attention during the meeting is directed towards my own performance in language terms. I know that I must strive to break the habit of

⁷ Later during my research, I also come across Coffey's (1999) observations about this.

being too critical of my Swedish, since it might distract my attention from more important observations (Research diary, September, 2014).

While visiting the schools for the staff meetings, I also had private meetings with the class teachers of my focus classes in both schools in order to have a more detailed conversation about what my research and presence in their classrooms during the autumn would actually entail for them and their pupils. We also agreed with both of them that I would visit their classes to introduce myself to the pupils some weeks prior to starting the actual fieldwork. Before the meeting with the pupils, I would prepare the informed consent forms to be able to distribute them to the pupils and their guardians – in order to get them back in time (Appendix 1). Moreover, the principals delivered a more general letter with the same content electronically to all pupils and their guardians in the field schools to inform them about my research prior to the beginning of the fieldwork.

In the co-located schools, even the negotiation process reflected the institutional separation of Finnish and Swedish in Finland: negotiation with principals, the contact with the municipal administration and meeting the staff all happened separately, although the fieldwork was physically taking place in the same building and a shared schoolyard. The spatial and temporal separation already began to manifest itself while negotiating entry and based on the communication preceding the field period it was possible to anticipate to some extent that the everyday practices of the two schools were somewhat separated. For instance, there were no regular organised meetings between the staff in the two schools and the principals proposed no such meeting for my research purposes either. As a researcher focusing on the co-located schools as an entity, I could have suggested a mutual staff meeting to discuss my research plan but did not at this point feel like wanting to interrupt but rather to adapt to their institutional practices as they were. The participants, too, seemed to be aware of the language-related spatial orders shaping their everyday life at the campus from the beginning.

After our discussion in the classroom, Mikko suggests taking me on a tour to see the school facilities. As we go around, he keeps presenting the school spaces in relation to language, even if I have not referred to it since we left the classroom. He mentions the upstairs corridor as belonging to the Finnish-speaking part, but as we come down the stairs, we arrive at a corridor, where “some bilingualism starts to emerge” (Research diary, Finnish-speaking school in Finland, September 2014).

The discursive construction of the boundaries between the institutional and linguistic spaces in the campus started during the first visits in the schools. Often, this happened when I was being introduced to the spatial practices of the campus by the pupils or the staff, as in the previous excerpt from my research diary.

The negotiations for field access in Sweden took place during the same autumn I was conducting fieldwork in the co-located school in Finland. In April and August 2014, I had initially contacted the principal of the school I was hoping to access later during the following spring semester without receiving any reply to my e-mails. However, completely immersed in preparing the fieldwork in Finland, I decided to re-attempt a more intensive contact later in the autumn semester. Finally, I managed to reach the principal of Sweden Finnish school by phone in early January 2015. During our short discussion, I was convinced that the reason for not being able to reach them earlier was their enormous workload rather than not being interested in participating. On the contrary, they seemed quite delighted with being contacted, and pleased by the idea of having someone do research on Sweden Finnish schools. During the phone call, the principal expressed their concern about the turbulent situation of Finnish language in the Swedish educational system and a rather slight research interest in the Sweden Finnish schools. We agreed that I would visit a meeting in early February to meet the staff and, assuming that everything went as planned, start the ethnographic fieldwork in early March.

On visiting the school in February 2015, I received a warm welcome from the principal and some of the teachers who were present at the meeting. It turned out that the meeting I was invited to was not for the whole staff but a smaller group who were particularly engaged with language issues in the school. Perhaps influenced by their particular interest in the topic, they also considered the potential for my research increasing the visibility of the political issues related to position of the Finnish language in Sweden as important.

The principal, five teachers and another member of the teaching staff are present at the meeting. I talk briefly about my background, my research interests in general and the aim of my doctoral project. I also tell them about the fieldwork I have already conducted in Finland. I proceed by explaining the aims and content of the fieldwork, and what is going to happen in practice. I emphasise the ethical commitments related to my study. This is something I have already discussed with the principal; there are only six Sweden Finnish independent schools in Sweden and it might be possible to identify the field school in my study even if I did what I could to mask the identification data. I told the principal that I was aware of this and that my obligation as a researcher is to write about the school in a way that does not harm anyone (Research diary, January 2015).

From the beginning, the school staff in Sweden was very open to discussing the position of Finnish in the Swedish educational system in a critical manner as well as some specific challenges related to this particular school. However, instead of

assuming that the whole school community was of equal interest to me, I had a feeling that the principal wished to direct me towards certain teachers who they considered as actively promoting language issues in the school as well as certain activities that they perhaps considered as essential in terms of my research. Indeed, the contact to these particular teachers was valuable in many ways, since through them I also gained a contact to a group of activists and professionals engaged in language and minority policy issues in the area. During the fieldwork, meetings with this group significantly enhanced my understanding of the local context.

Following the code of responsible conduct of research in Sweden, the conditions of the participation were negotiated with the principal instead of contacting the municipality for research permits. In the Sweden Finnish school, the principal required that an informed consent form be distributed to all pupils in the primary school classes. This way, the families would be granted the opportunity to decline the participation of their child even if they were not in my focus class, as I would also carry out participant observations outside the classrooms. The informed consent forms were distributed and returned via the class teachers prior to the beginning of my field period at the school (Appendix 2). All the information was provided in Finnish and Swedish.

4.2.2 Participant observations and fieldnotes

The idea of place as lived but open invokes the inevitable question of how researchers themselves are entangled in, participate in the production of, and are co-present in the ethnographic places they share with research participants, their materialities and power relations (Pink, 2015, 34).

I began my fieldwork in Finland in late October by dividing my time between the two institutions three days a week: typically, I would spend Mondays at the Finnish-speaking school and Wednesdays at the Swedish-speaking school. Mondays and Wednesdays were also when the respective schools had their staff meetings, which I sought to attend regularly. This way, I was able to observe the practices of the focus class throughout the day and get to spend more time with the pupils at one go. This, I assumed, would facilitate getting to know them and, maybe even more importantly, in them accepting me as a part of their class for the rest of the fall semester. On Thursdays, I would change from one school to another halfway through the day. After the first two weeks, I conceded that this arrangement was not sufficient to engage me with the focus classes the way I wanted. I felt that I would have had to be present even more frequently, particularly at the outset in order to become familiar with the pupils and staff. Thus, I decided to visit the schools four days a week at least for some period of time.

I would participate in all the subjects taught in their own classroom, as well as music and crafts taught in other classroom spaces, which the Swedish- and Finnish-speaking schools shared but used at different times. The handicrafts particularly, divided into very gendered groups of needlework and carpentry,⁸ provided me with opportunities to engage in more informal discussions with the pupils about their interests. These discussions would also touch upon my research very often. The only subject that I decided to exclude in the participant observations was physical education. This was for both practical and analytical reasons. In my focus classes, the PE lessons always took place either first thing in the morning or last thing in the afternoon. Thus, not participating in them enabled me to cut the length of the day in a logical manner and get more in-depth observations in other, more language-mediated subjects instead. For the sake of coherence, I decided to manage the issue with PE in a similar way in Sweden as well, being aware however that my decision might exclude me from situations that would be relevant considering the spatial interest of my study. In the lunch breaks, I would join my focus class in the cafeteria and share a table with some of the pupils. I tried to have lunch with as many pupils as possible but also many times ended up sitting with the pupils or teachers who offered me a place in their table. For the most part, I would spend the breaks in the yard, which was crowded with both pupils from the Finnish-speaking and the Swedish-speaking school at the same time. Typically, I would wander around the yard with my notebook even if I found it difficult to take notes while standing up, particularly on the cooler or rainy autumn days, wearing my gloves or holding an umbrella. In many instances, I found the notebook was an artefact that had more than practical significance in terms of the research (see also Lappalainen, 2006). The pupils would pay attention to my notebook, asking about what I wrote and the number of pages I wrote. During the breaks some of them would ask to write and draw in it and I would sometimes let them.

As a researcher, I also had to negotiate my position in and between the two institutions that constituted the field of my research. The fact that I was conducting similar research in two separate institutions also had an impact on how I was positioned in relation to them in terms of space and time. Despite that, I consider the two schools constitute a unified material and social research field rather than two separate ones; the institutional division between the Finnish- and the Swedish-speaking schools had an influence on my thoughts on what actually constituted the field in my research and what kinds of positions were available there for me as a researcher in particular spaces, places and at particular times.

⁸ The pupils could choose whether they wanted to participate in needlework or carpentry. Typically, the girls would choose needlework, as the boys went for carpentry. In the Finnish-speaking class, some girls opted for carpentry but there were no boys in the needlework group.

As I spend my days in the two schools on alternate days, I find myself in the same physical space from day to day, but still somehow existing in another social space from where it is difficult to reach the social space of the parallel school. Somehow, I feel like being more distant with the pupils on those days when I am not a part of their social and spatial orders. Even if we happen to meet in the cafeteria, most of the pupils won't approach me in the same way, as if they consider me as temporarily belonging on the other side of the same social and spatial border, which is often constructed between the schools in their talk (Research diary, May 2015, Finland).

In the co-located schools, I was positioned by the staff as a medium between two institutions, whose everyday life is rather separate despite the shared school building. In the following interview excerpt, the principal of the Swedish-medium school is curious to find out what kind of differences between the two schools I have noticed during my stay.

Tuuli: Have you thought about something in particular concerning this project during the autumn?

Principal: No, but I have thought about that it would be interesting to know how you have, what differences have you noticed when you have been there and here. Like concerning the instruction and events in the classroom because when I have been there I have noticed the difference myself that it is really organised and really peaceful there (Interview with the principal of the Swedish-speaking school in Finland, January, 2015, orig. in Swedish).

In the Sweden Finnish school in Sweden, I adopted a similar way of participating in all the lessons taught in the home class of my focus group as well as in the music and crafts teaching that was organised in other classrooms. In the lunch break, I would follow my focus group to the cafeteria, and sit wherever there was a seat available, since the pupils in my class could choose their table themselves. This way, I would also often have a chance to talk with pupils in other classes and those staff members I did not regularly meet in the staff room. In the co-located campus in Finland, the alternation between the two schools contributed to the formation of my routine as an ethnographer, whereas in the bilingual school in Sweden, I found it more difficult to perceive the spatial and temporal practices of the school. The sense of familiarity with the Finnish educational system and school culture probably contributed to my experience of adapting and belonging, while many curricular and informal practices, routines and habits in Sweden felt distant.

So far, I can't help but be confused about the schedules and practices of the school. I can neither grasp the rhythm of the school day nor the constellation of the groups that sometimes seem to function as parallel classes and sometimes separately. Here and there in the class timetable there are slots dedicated to unfinished tasks, *eget arbete*. During these slots, the pupils seem to be in whatever classroom. After visiting the ninth-grade classroom to introduce myself, I am sitting in the corridor, which does not seem to quieten down even during the lessons. Pupils of all ages keep going back and forth, up and down the stairs. The girl who had already come to talk to me in the morning asks me to join her in the afternoon club (Fieldnotes, Sweden Finnish school in Sweden, March, 2015).

In educational ethnography, fighting familiarity has been designated as a central task of the research (Delamont, 2014; Gordon et al, 2006). The school, as a mundane and familiar institution for those conducting research there, readily engages in social and spatial routines that might be difficult to question. According to Delamont (2014), the ways of fighting familiarity in education include revisiting insightful educational ethnographies on formal education in other cultures, visiting unusual schools as well as taking the standpoint of the other. While planning and conducting the fieldwork in the co-located schools in terms of the schedules, I tried to remain alert and fight off the risk of becoming too accustomed to the institutional routines by altering the schedules of my field days. Sometimes I would spend the whole day or even two in a row in the same school and occasionally change perspectives halfway through the day. This, for me, was about fighting the routines the institutions contribute to, including in spatial terms.

The production of ethnographic knowledge is an embodied experience and a variety of spatial negotiations in relation to the positioning of the ethnographer's embodied self take place during the fieldwork (Coffey, 1999; Pink, 2015). I consider finding my place in the spatial routines of the school as one of these negotiations. In the co-located schools, I would typically sit at the back of the room during the lessons in the regular classrooms on a separate stool or chair behind the back row of pupils in their desks. In the Sweden Finnish school, I would be seated alone at a round table at the back of the class. The pupils were seated at their own desks separated from each other, which were usually organised in traditional rows facing the front. In the Finnish-speaking class in Finland, the pupils and their desks were sometimes arranged in groups of four. My choice of sitting at the back of the class was first and foremost for practical reasons and provided a vantage point over what happened in the classroom regardless of the seating arrangements. I did not attempt to be an invisible observer, but did prefer to be located so that the pupils would pay as little attention to me as possible in the midst of their

schoolwork. If someone was not present in the classroom, I would sometimes occupy their desk for a lesson or a few to gain a more authentic pupil perspective on the classroom space. Whenever doing so, however, I kept feeling clumsy in the desk designed for children, being at the centre of unwanted attention and feeling “out of place” (see also Valentine, 2001). This also seemed to confuse the pupils, who had quickly become accustomed to me having my own place at the back of the classroom. Even if I had my own spot, rather isolated from the rest of the people present in the class, I soon became intertwined in the social and spatial patterns of the classroom. This happened in all the three schools I was observing in, but in a different manner depending on the habits, routines, and physical layout of the classrooms. My seat became a regular pit stop for the wanderers in the classroom. Pupils kept constantly checking if I was reacting – by writing – to what went on in the classrooms that they considered noteworthy, funny or interesting (see also Lappalainen, 2006). Some pupils adopted the task of regularly checking how I was writing my fieldnotes, which was measured by the number of pages, and it usually received unreserved admiration.

For the observations in the co-located school, I had a single notebook for taking fieldnotes from both the Finnish-speaking and Swedish-speaking schools. This was one of the research practices that helped me to focus my analytical gaze on the co-located school campus as a spatial unity, instead of treating them as separate institutions and separate research fields. Even though I would typically spend the entire day observing one class and not switch between schools halfway through the day, I aimed at identifying connecting points between the institutions, whose formal and informal activities were more or less separate. In doing so, my guiding theoretical thought was Massey’s (2005) notion about spaces and places being open and mutually constituted, paying attention to the ways in which social spaces question and stretch the boundaries of classrooms and other bounded physical spaces in school buildings.

In ethnographic observations, writing is participation and fieldnotes can be considered as disrupted descriptions of the events I was participating in. Elina Paju (2013) points out the ethnographer’s attempt to represent a flow of events in the fieldnotes as being a tricky task. In my writing, too, I could recognise the pursuit of coherent narratives, which actually did not give a rightful representation of the multitude of events taking place in the space-time under observation. Given the theoretical premises and the particular focus on the dynamics of space in my research, accounts of the material spaces in the school environment appear frequently in my fieldnotes too. Detailed descriptions of the settings are considered as a basic activity related to ethnographic representation (Jeffrey, 2018). However, through these representations in fieldnotes and ethnographic narratives, the researcher not only describes some shared material reality but also participates in constructing the spaces of the school (Rajander, 2010). During this research project, the languages used in the field have also shaped these representations through

my fieldnotes (see also Martin-Jones et al., 2017). In all schools, I would mostly describe the events in Finnish but usually write down direct conversations in their original language, which in the majority of cases was either Finnish or Swedish. Occasionally, I would add spontaneous side notes in Swedish or English. Blommaert and Dong Jie (2010) understand the multilingualism in fieldnotes as an epistemic process, which sheds light on the ways in which the researcher uses their language resources in order to construct new knowledge. Moreover, I understand the spontaneous use of different languages in my fieldnotes as provoked by the emotional connotations of my own linguistic repertoire in different times and social spaces (see Busch, 2017).

At the beginning of the fieldwork, my aim was to type up the handwritten notes on my computer the same day or at the latest during the days I was taking a break from the observations and working at home or at my office. The sooner I returned to the original notes, the better I recalled the situations, material surroundings, conversations and the related reflections. The sooner I typed them up, the more the final notes differed from the initial ones, since I was able to complement them with observations I had not had time to jot down while observing but could still recall. Usually I would sit by the computer and type after returning from the field school but the precision and detail of notes usually made this insufficient for covering the whole day of observations. Particularly at the beginning of the field periods in Finland and Sweden, I would provide systematic and detailed descriptions of the events during the lessons, since it helped me to get into the swing of writing and stimulated my attention (see also Jeffrey, 2018). In addition to the notebook for observations, I had a separate research diary on my computer, where I would write down details and decisions related to the research process as well as more general reflections of my experiences in the field. However, after increasing the number of field days from three to four in the co-located school in Finland, I had to accept that was I not able to type my fieldnotes according to my original plan and that this would probably affect the precision of the final notes. I was nevertheless certain that the increase in the field days would pay off in the end. Moreover, after three weeks of observing in the co-located schools and long evenings of typing I was so tired that it started to have an impact on my attentiveness during the day. At that point, I was forced to re-organise my tasks within the project and decided to prioritise attentive presence in the field over the up-to-date typing of fieldnotes. To prevent the loss of valuable observations as the gap grew wider, I would pick events and discussions I considered particularly relevant and type them during the same day, even if the rest of the notes were only typed some weeks later. Such relevant events typically included observations that were directly related to my analytical interests or longer, spontaneous discussions with members of the staff. At the end of the ethnographic fieldwork, I had captured fieldnotes from 49 days in the co-located schools altogether and from 21 days in the Sweden Finnish school.

4.2.3 Interviews with the school staff

As a part of the ethnographic fieldwork, I conducted individual interviews with the teaching staff (principals, teachers and school assistants) in all three schools. The aim of the interviews was to engage in a conversation about their perspectives on language policies in education and their work as educators in a co-located or a bilingual school. In particular, I was interested in the meanings attributed to space in minority language education and in the accounts that participate in the construction of the discourses on language and space. In the context of ethnography, participant observations and interviews are often discussed in terms of how the knowledge gained using these methods relate to each other. The relationship between observations and interviews has been described as identifying inconsistencies between what participants say and what they do, even if this view has also been criticised as ignoring the complexity of social life (Atkinson & Coffey, 2003; Walford, 2018). However, rather than providing objective information on the educational practices or the participants' views in the contexts researched, I consider any ethnographic material as well as ethnographic interviews as generated accounts and performances, constructed under certain discursive conditions and power relations between the researcher and the participant (Atkinson, 2015; Miettola, 2007). Moreover, specifically in the context of minority language education, I consider the educators' roles as particularly shaping the positions from which they decide to speak. From this perspective, there was a difference in how the staff members in the Finnish-speaking school and those in the Swedish-speaking school and the Sweden Finnish school participated in the interviews. Typical among the staff in the minority language schools was a tendency to position oneself in relation to the language policy agenda of the school. A particular political agency emerged in their interviews more often than in the Finnish-speaking school. In the Sweden Finnish school, an interesting negotiation of identities and belonging often took place prior to the interviews; some of the teachers who did not necessarily position themselves as Sweden Finns hesitated to participate in the interviews. Overall, the staff members in all three schools seemed to have a distinct impression of who was the ideal person to be interviewed on issues related to language policy. Not even in the bilingual Sweden Finnish school were language policy issues necessarily considered to concern all members of staff.

I mentioned the possibility to participate in the interviews to the principals, teachers and assistants while visiting the first staff meeting in each school to introduce myself. As all the schools were quite small, it was possible for me to approach the staff members individually during the field period to discuss whether they were interested in sharing their thoughts with me in an interview. I presented the interview as an informal discussion on subjects that were central to my research interests. The interviews with the school staff were conducted at the end of the field periods, during the afternoons or at longer breaks during the school days.

In all three schools, a majority of the teaching staff were positive about the thought of being interviewed in general, even if the schedules eventually turned out to be too difficult to arrange for some of them. At the point when the interviews were conducted, I had been around in the daily life of the schools for some time and I felt that some degree of trust and familiarity had started to build between me and the staff. This probably facilitated their participation in the interviews and enabled them to share personal and critical ideas about their work and identity as well. In the Finnish-speaking school in Finland and in the Sweden Finnish school in Sweden, the interviews took place in classrooms, whereas in the Swedish-speaking school in Finland they were conducted in the office where the pupils were interviewed. I would begin the interviews by presenting the research agreement form (Appendix 3) including terms for using the interview data, which I would then ask them to sign if they agreed. The interviews were presented to the participants as thematic interviews or conversations with some predetermined topics. The interview outlines were slightly different in Finland and Sweden since some of the questions were contextualised in co-located schools (Appendix 4) whereas others were focused specifically on Finnish-speaking education in Sweden (Appendix 5). In general, the interview topics were theoretically informed, aligned with the analytical interest in language policies and spatiality. Moreover, in the formation of the interview questions, my observations and the time spent in the field schools also had an influence (see also Tolonen & Palmu, 2007). Some of the questions were intended to elicit the participants' views and ideologies related to language and education, whereas others focused on the educational practices in the schools. The interviews lasted approximately half an hour to one and a half hours.

All of the 23 interviews with the staff in Finland and Sweden were recorded and transcribed. I transcribed the interviews conducted in Finnish and two interviews conducted in Swedish in the bilingual school in Sweden myself. All of the interviews with the staff in the Swedish-speaking school in Finland were transcribed by a company providing transcription services for research purposes. This facilitated my work significantly, since transcribing was extremely time-consuming particularly while dealing with recorded data in another language than my mother tongue. Considering transcription as an initial stage of the analysis particularly within an ethnographic paradigm (see Pink, 2015), I was aware of the potential imbalance between the interviews I had transcribed myself and those that had been transcribed for me. To partially ameliorate the disparity, I took time to listen to the recordings of the interviews from the Swedish-speaking school, making notes on the conversations.

4.2.4 Participant photography and photo-elicitation interviews with the pupils

The definitions of and arguments for visual methods in ethnography are many, most researchers arguing for getting additional information by using a variety of data. Moreover, a different kind of understanding of the contexts studied can be produced through the use of participatory visual methods (Harper, 2002; Pink, 2007; Rose, 2012, Holm, 2018a.). In the framework of my study, visual ethnography and participant photography is understood and applied for a variety of purposes. Firstly, I consider it to be a method for the participating pupils to explore and discuss their school environment and the events taking place in their everyday lives there. At the same time, it gives the participants an opportunity to exercise at least some impact on the study through the material they produce (Holm, 2014). Secondly, it provides the researcher with partial access to situations and places where she could not be present for one reason or another or which she was not able to consider as important. Thirdly, and particularly given the theoretical perspective of this study, it adds a visual dimension to understanding children's spatial cultures and linguistic spaces as consisting of physical, social and mental dimensions as it is seen in this study (see also Rasmussen, 2004).

In general, participant photography can be considered as having the potential to interrupt the traditional power relationships in research (Holm, 2018a.; Clark-Ibañez, 2007). Moreover, participant photography enables the exploration of spatialities that might be difficult for children to describe verbally. In addition to the material boundaries and configurations that contribute to the construction of linguistic spaces in education, I consider the linguistic divisions to consist to a great extent of abstract social components and power relations that photography has helped to visualise, both for the pupils and for me as a researcher. In other words, it has enabled a more nuanced picture of what I refer to as the materiality of language policies. During the period of ethnographic data production, a large amount of visual data was produced through participant photography by the pupils in all three schools. A majority of the pupils in the focus classes, 37 of them altogether, participated in the photo-elicitation task. In the final weeks of the first periods spent in the schools, I asked the responsible teachers of each class for a moment to talk to the pupils in front of the class, in order to introduce them to a photography task related to my research project. Even though the introductory session took place in the classroom before a regular lesson and the teacher was present, I introduced the task not as embedded in the school work but as a co-researching project that helped me to understand their perspective on language and school space in a more varied manner. I introduced the pupils to the questions I hoped they would ponder while taking the photos. For me, the aim of using participant photography was to gain perspectives on how the pupils perceived and represented

their school space in general and in relation to language issues. I started each introductory session by reminding the pupils of my research interest being the use of multiple languages in their school environment particularly. However, not wanting to unnecessarily restrict their focus and define what was valuable to the research purposes through the instructions, the guiding questions were quite open and enabled the pupils to narrate their school life quite freely. Through the photographs, the pupils were asked to tell a story about where and with whom they spent time, what kinds of activities they were involved in and what were important places to them in the school area. In formulating the instructions, Katarina Gustafson's (2006) aim to understand children's identity construction in relation to space through similar, simple questions was helpful. In the instructions, language was not explicated as a particular topic of interest. The instructions were presented in accordance with the official languages of each school, that is, monolingually in the Finnish- and Swedish-speaking schools and bilingually in the Sweden Finnish school. In retrospect, the monolingual instructions participated in the reconstruction of language separation in the co-located schools and possibly in the pupils' orientation in the task as well. This can be considered as one of the practices, through which I as a researcher participated in the reconstruction of the prevailing linguistic power relations of the schools. In the co-located schools, a specific research agreement form on the use and publication of photo material was distributed at this point, since the original informed consent form did not sufficiently cover the prospective publication of the photos. In the bilingual school in Sweden, a paragraph defining the use of the photo material had already been included in the first informed consent form.

After introducing the pupils to the photo task, I asked them to consider whether they wanted to participate and also if they wished to work individually or in pairs. I then asked them to come to see me so that we could put their names on the schedule. I had brought two digital cameras for each class to use and on the wall of the classroom I placed a schedule where everyone could see when their turn was. Due to the varying regulations related to the use of mobile phones in the lower classes of comprehensive schools, I did not consider letting the pupils use their own phones for the photos. Moreover, the camera as a separate artefact connected to the study can be thought of as a research instrument that has particular social significance to the children, while it participates in the interaction and enables specific ways of acting (Paju, 2015). If the pupils wished to, they were also allowed to document their way to and from school and free time between the two days of taking the photos. However, only a few chose to do this, as the instructions focused on documenting the events during the school days. The instructions were placed on the classroom wall next to the photo schedule as well as handed out to each participating pupil as a paper copy.

The voluntariness of participation was emphasised to the pupils in the introductory session. However, the class dynamics (the "culture" of the class) and the

role of the teacher in each classroom seemed to influence the participation in the photography task. From the beginning, the class teacher in the Finnish-speaking class, Mikko, had been showing an interest in my research project, including me in various events and discussions in the classroom and encouraging the pupils to show a similar interest. Regardless of the teachers' stance on or interest in the project, participation was individually negotiated with each pupil. Not all the pupils showed an interest in participating directly after the introductory session. I did not at any point have the feeling that some of the pupils in the Finnish-speaking class would have been reluctant to participate or only participated because Mikko was encouraging them to. On the contrary, the ways in which my research was present in the classroom space seemed to spark curiosity in the pupils and make me a more accessible person to many of them. At first, some of the boys in the class hesitated to participate in taking photos or later in being interviewed but eventually told me they had changed their minds and wanted to participate after all. In my focus class in the neighbouring Swedish-speaking school, the outlook on my presence in general and the photography task was more reserved. I often wondered if this was due to my ability to introduce the aims of my research and convey my own enthusiasm for the topic in another language than my own, in Swedish. In the Swedish-speaking class, I managed all classroom situations by using Swedish but sometimes had to lean on notes to be able to recall exactly what I was supposed to tell the pupils. The class teacher, Fredrik, took a more passive role in terms of my research and mostly participated by providing me with the time I needed to discuss my research and the related tasks with the pupils. He did not participate in these discussions himself or display any particular interest in the study in front of the pupils but rather withdrew from these situations. To encourage more participants in the Swedish-speaking class, I talked on different occasions to the pupils who had not showed up voluntarily after the photography introduction, in order to check if they wanted to participate after all or if there was something in particular that made them hesitate. Some of these pupils decided to participate after I had approached them individually, whereas others kept to their decision to refrain from the photography task.

The events around the photography task took rather different shapes in each class depending on how many pupils participated in taking photos. As mentioned in the previous section, the class teacher in each class had a significant role in shaping this dynamic and an impact on pupil participation. In the Finnish-speaking school in Finland, all of the pupils in the class I was observing participated in both the photography task and the photo-elicitation interviews. In the Swedish-speaking focus class, a majority of the girls participated whereas almost half the boys dropped out as photographers but were actively involved in posing for the pupils with cameras. In Sweden, a similar pattern of participation emerged but was reversed in terms of gender: even the two girls who did not participate in taking the photos sought an active role in the photos taken by their classmates and

planning what should be included in the photos. However, some of the pupils actively avoided being photographed by their peers who were in charge of the cameras, particularly in Finland. Thus, during the participatory projects, many kinds of negotiations on participation and the content can be considered to have taken place. Moreover, the spatial control the children were an object of in these schools had an impact on what was photographed and what was left out because of the restrictions in their use of space (see also Holm, 2018a.).

The body of photo material produced during this project would enable a profound visual analysis of the spatial representations of language and culture in social and material school space. However, this would require a thorough discussion of the epistemology and practices of visual analysis, which is not within the scope of this dissertation. Thus, the visual data has been categorised and stored for a more detailed analysis in the future. Moreover, publishing photos would have required particular ethical consideration, particularly since the study not only focuses on pupil perspectives but also physical spaces that are easily identifiable. The photos have been important first and foremost in enabling access to pupil perspectives and gaining insight into how they perceive and represent school space through their own photos and what kinds of meanings they attach to the use of space in their talk. This was done by writing short descriptions of the photos in the classroom and discussing the photos in photo-elicitation interviews. After all the pupils who volunteered to participate had taken turns to take photos, I printed out the photos and once again asked the class teachers for some time to talk to the pupils. All participating pupils were provided with the prints of their own photos with some empty lines for notes next to each photo. I asked them to go through them and then pick at least ten photos that they considered as important or as best representing their everyday life at school. Moreover, the pupils could cross out pictures that they did not want me to include in the material of the study. I then asked the pupils to write short descriptions of the ten photos in the prints. These ten (or more) photos chosen and described by the pupils were taken as a starting-point for the photo-elicitation interviews conducted some days later. Of the 37 pupils who had been taking photos, two did not participate in the interviews merely writing descriptions of the photos they had taken.

The most common participatory method in the field of social sciences, *photo-elicitation interviews* provide the participants an opportunity to explain why they have taken a photograph and what is important in that particular photo for them (Holm, 2018a.) The interviews were audio recorded and roughly transcribed by me as a whole after finishing the field work. Moreover, I conducted detailed transcriptions of segments in the interviews that were particularly relevant with regard to the analytical focus. The descriptions of the photos written by the pupils were included in the transcriptions of the interviews. In Finland, the photo-elicitation interviews were conducted in the same pairs or groups of three with whom the pupils had been photographing. Two pupils in the Finnish-speaking class wished

to be interviewed separately. I did not apply any particular outline for the interviews with pupils, wishing to give them more freedom to define the topics, activities and places they wanted to focus on. At the beginning of the interview, I told them we would go through the photos they had chosen but that they could also present other photos or bring up topics that were important to them. I emphasised that the aim was to talk freely rather than conducting an interview in which I was the one to ask the questions which their task was to answer. During the discussions it turned out that the photos indeed afforded an entry into a goldmine of narratives of the places and happenings in the pupils' everyday lives but also to more abstract dynamics and social hierarchies in the school communities. My perception was that the pupils could more easily reflect on their sense of spaces by leaning on the photos for narrating their feelings and experiences of their everyday surroundings. Aligned with a central principle of critical ethnography, participatory methods, photography and the photo-elicitation interviews can be considered as co-construction of knowledge (Giampapa, 2012). Regarding the analytical interest in language and space, many of the photos enabled me to make references to and ask additional questions about the things I was particularly interested in, such as the social and linguistic boundaries the pupils experienced in their school life. In particular, the photos of the co-located schools during the breaks taken in the schoolyard led to interesting discussions of the tacit linguistic spaces and boundaries as experienced by the pupils. Moreover, absences of certain places in the photographs, which I found important considering the pupils' use and sense of space, could also be inquired about in the photo-elicitation interviews (see also Rose, 2012).

4.2.5 Writing as analysis

Rather than being a separate phase in the research process, Elina Paju (2013) describes the ethnographic analysis as a continuous dialogue between the empirical data and the theoretical framework. In this study, I understand the ethnographic fieldwork, the development of the theoretical framework and, finally, the emergence of the preliminary analytical patterns as processes that intertwine and overlap during the research project (see also Lappalainen, 2007). Moreover, I align with the notion of theory-driven ethnographic analysis as two-fold, as Anna-Maija Niemi (2015, 41) claims. Thus, the concepts deriving from the theoretical framework have directed my focus during the observations and the reading of the ethnographic data as well as enabling a subtler analysis of themes that have caught my attention during the fieldwork.

The overarching method of the analysis has been an ethnographic and discursive reading of the data, which questions the existence of some univocal truth to be found in the research material, focusing instead on how discourses enable and produce certain rationalities (St. Pierre, 2000). Aligned with the post-structuralist

notions of the construction of ethnographic knowledge, the focus is instead on the representations, discourses and meanings given to language and space, and the ways in which power operates in the negotiation of these meanings (see also Niemi, 2015; Lahelma & Gordon, 2007). The intention has been to discover patterns that keep being repeated across space and time (Heller, 2011) and hegemonic “truths” related to language policies and language management in particular. An equally important aim has been to capture the multiple voices that participate in the negotiation of the subject positions available, and the voices of resistance arising from these negotiations. An overarching analytical interest has been spatiality, i.e., how space, as both symbolic and material, is made meaningful as a dimension in making language policies. Moreover, instead of thinking about spatiality as merely discursive, the analytical approach also acknowledges the material dimension to space as enabling and constraining certain forms of action (Richardson & Jensen, 2003).

Prior to the actual analytical reading of the data, a phase of organising and categorising the material took place. This might be described as a pre-analysis as a preparation for the theory-driven reading. (see also Niemi, 2015.) Once all the material had been transcribed, the complete set of fieldnotes and interviews were uploaded to Atlas.ti, a software facilitating the organisation and analysis of qualitative data. The program served mainly as a tool for organising the data into categories and subcategories, some of which the theoretical framework informed, whereas some derived from other observations that kept being repeated while out in the field or going through the transcribed data afterwards. The program facilitated the management of a large body of data, made it possible to perceive the appearance and the relations between the categories, and to identify particular content and situations. In the ethnographic analysis, both thematic reading combining preliminary themes with those emerging during the fieldwork and analytical reading using the central theoretical concepts were utilised (see also Gordon et al. 2006). For the purposes of the analysis, I would export the thematised excerpts into separate files and sometimes print them out on paper to be able to add notes and remarks using a pen. During the process of analysis, the categorised data excerpts have been written and re-written into main text and making connections between and within the categories of data as well as literature. This was done separately for each article, guided by their analytical scope. In analysing data for the articles of this study, fieldnotes, interviews and photo-elicitation interviews have been treated as equivalent data and read side-by-side together with the theories and concepts that have guided the analyses in each article. These theories and concepts have been slightly different in each article, depending on the specific questions and data excerpts that I, together with my co-authors, examined at that moment.

The principle of reflexivity in critical ethnographic research (see e.g. Johnson, 2017) also applies in terms of ethnographic analysis. Reflexive writing can be

considered as one way of dealing with researcher positionality and acknowledging the role of the ethnographer as a research instrument. Reflexivity in ethnography can be strengthened through writing about the relationship to the site, the people, and their relations. Finally, such analytical fieldnotes can be considered as a manifestation of the ethnographic analysis process, which does not separate data production and analysis but where these phases overlap and intertwine (see e.g. Jeffrey, 2018). Ethnographic knowledge, as Rajander (2010) points out, is partial, fragmented, overlapping and often controversial as well. Instead of being a transparent description of reality, ethnographic data is socially constructed, and standardised to fit a particular norm of the community, which the researcher has to grasp to be able to contextualise a particular narrative (Delamont, 2014). Thus, the path from a collection of ethnographic data to ethnographic narratives and to the regulated structures of research articles has not always been the most straightforward. The presentation of such knowledge in an article-based dissertation has been problematic at times. During the year following the fieldwork I seriously struggled with this task and even considered writing a monograph instead of an article-based dissertation in order to be able to bring more context, particularly to the description and analysis of the spatial configurations as physical surroundings.

Rajander (2010) describes the nature of ethnographic analysis in her own work as “writing towards analysis”. Herein, she includes discussions with teachers, their expectations and the difficulty of responding to them as well as examples of ethnographic conversations in the fieldnotes (Rajander, *ibid.* 78). In some phases of my study, I have very much related to the idea of the analytical work as proceeding in interplay with the encounters in the field schools. Considering the context of the study in language and minority education, it was to be anticipated that many of the staff members were dedicated to this particular topic and by implication, entertained expectations of or a specific interest in my research. However, there was an interesting difference between the Swedish-speaking school in Finland and Sweden Finnish school in Sweden in this sense. Even if minority language issues were present in both, the staff in the Swedish-speaking school in Finland did not seem to identify as language policy agents in the same sense as the majority of those in Sweden. This also had an impact on the expectations they had regarding my research. Thus, I consider that the analysis of the material from the bilingual school in Sweden has to a greater extent been influenced by the discussions with the staff members’ language group, debates with the staff in the coffee room as well as curious queries about my primary impressions and interpretations. In Sweden, major expectations were imposed on my research because of the unstable conditions in language and education policies with regard to Finnish. The recent years had witnessed a decrease in the availability of Finnish-speaking education and the future did not seem any brighter to many of the professionals working in the field of minority education. Despite being somewhat sceptical about the future

of minority language education in Swedish schools, the school staff and other actors I became acquainted with through my field contacts often expressed their desire that my research might even have some impact on the educational conditions.

4.3 Ethical considerations and researcher positionality

During the course of this study, the research ethical guidelines were provided by the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity (TENK) and the Swedish Research Council (*Vetenskapsrådet*, CODEX). These principles have been applied to the ethnographic fieldwork (informed consent, data production and confidentiality described in the previous sections) and to the dissemination of the outcomes of this study in conference presentations and publications. The most significant ethical considerations in this study are related to the protection of the identity of the field schools, particularly considering them as potentially vulnerable minority language contexts. The small number of both co-located schools in southern Finland as well as Sweden Finnish schools in all of Sweden has meant that some information about the schools and details of the research data cannot be published even though they might provide new perspectives on the analysis, such as detailed information about the division of the pupils or school staff in terms of their social or linguistic backgrounds in particular schools. However, given the theoretical interest of this study, I do not consider this particularly problematic.

This study concentrates on educational spaces as discursive-material constructions. Providing more detailed descriptions of the field schools' material spaces, their location, floor plans and other characteristics would have allowed a more in-depth analysis of the dimensions of spatiality in relation to my research interests. However, as Paju (2013) also concluded in her study on spatiality and materiality in a Finnish kindergarten, certain information that might be considered valuable for the analysis would have undermined the confidentiality of the participating schools. Moreover, Holm (2018a.) mentions ethical issues related to publishing visual data as one of the main concerns in doing visual ethnographic research in education. During this research project, the participating pupils have taken hundreds of photographs in which their school life is represented from a variety of perspectives. The visual analysis of these photos would have allowed a wonderful analysis of their sense of spaces in relation to language and in general but also made the promise of confidentiality difficult to redeem, since these facilities are easily identifiable by many people. Thus, some of these decisions related to ethical considerations have been taken at the expense of analytical potential.

The tradition of feminist school ethnography has had a significant influence on my research, specifically in terms of research ethics. This has particularly informed sensitivity to listening to what people have to say and doing them justice through the interpretation of their words and actions (see also Delamont, 2014; Niemi, 2015; Lappalainen, 2007; Rajander, 2010). This aim can be considered to

manifest itself in the representation of the participants through the ethnographic data. Madison (2012, in Johnson, 2017) talks about the risk of placing participants in a questionable light and urges the ethnographer to consider the context of their lives in relation to the structures of power that constitute their actions. As the researcher possessing power over the written representations of the participants, I have had two specific concerns in the course of this project. First, choosing the material for the articles in the rather limited formats of research articles and making decisions on whose voice is being heard, in terms of not only language but also gender and other differences. Another concern has been the amount of ethnographic data in relation to the research “output”, since only two articles of this dissertation draw on the broad ethnographic material. Within these conditions, mostly determined by the prevailing science and publication policies, I have at times struggled with providing a diversity of representations and recognising the multiple voices of the participants.

The linguistic positioning of the ethnographer is a result of complex negotiations of power and identity as well as linguistic and other forms of capital (Giamapa, 2012). During this study, a great number of decisions related to language practices and positioning in relation to language identity have been taken and their consequences have been contemplated along the way. Ideological, political and pragmatic perspectives have overlapped and contradicted each other in these considerations of myself as a researcher, compromising in the end and being shaped into words and representations – in English. As a native speaker of Finnish and a researcher writing in English I have been continuously forced to position myself in relation to the language choices I make, not only in terms of the educational and national spaces in my research but also in terms of the language and publication policies in the academic community. In line with the premises of the theoretical and methodological framework of my study, the language choices become an unavoidable dimension in terms of the power and language policy agency of the researcher.

In the framework of language policy ethnography, I also consider my own language-related practices and negotiations as participating in the everyday language policies taking place in the field (see Johnson, 2017; Martin-Jones, Andrews & Martin, 2017). The constant reflections on language choice and linguistic positioning were present from the beginning of my fieldwork both in the co-located schools and in the bilingual school. In the following excerpt from my fieldnotes in the bilingual school in Sweden, I describe the unease related to a particular, yet quite typical situation, in which both internal and explicit negotiations between the language policies of the school and my own and the pupils’ linguistic positioning and resources take place. In this particular situation, I am meeting my focus class for the first time to introduce myself and tell them about my research in front of the class.

In my home class it turns out that there are both pupils who don't speak Swedish at all and those who don't speak any Finnish. I decide to begin my presentation talk in Finnish (which is also encouraged by the teacher) and continue or repeat in Swedish if necessary. I immediately become aware of the situation being extremely tricky for me, since it's difficult to change language on the run or keep track of delivering the same content in both languages. I begin by telling them about myself and my research in Finnish and ask the pupils what they know about the profession of researcher. During the other pupils' replies, the pupil with no proficiency in Finnish remarks that they do not understand what they should do. I become aware of excluding this pupil and promise to say the same things in Swedish shortly. However, after switching to Swedish, I am also aware of some of the other pupils not being able to participate in the discussion (Fieldnotes, Sweden Finnish school in Sweden, March, 2015, orig. in Finnish).

Following this occasion, I found it difficult to remember what content I had eventually delivered in which language. Most significantly, I could recall the unease I felt at excluding the only pupil not proficient in Finnish and their emotional reaction to not being able to understand what was going on. Then again, being aware of the position of Finnish outside the school made me consider my language choices as also having a political dimension. However, this sense of unease and inconsistency was something that followed me throughout the fieldwork in various encounters. I kept insisting on a certain coherence in my language policies, constantly reflecting on my language choice in relation to the social and institutional orders and power relations framing the use of Finnish and Swedish in this context.

In multilingual research contexts, the connection between language resources and the negotiation of identities between the researchers and those being researched should be reflected on. It might enable the display of sensitivity towards the power relations that are often thought of as fixed and dichotomous (Martin-Jones et al., 2017). In my case, the occasional insecurity in the use of Swedish was a base for the negotiation of power relations between me and the Swedish-speaking participants. I would sometimes feel extremely hesitant and self-conscious about entering a situation or a discussion particularly in bigger groups of children. Regarding my linguistic resources, I felt that my Swedish was better for discussion with the adults of the school, rather than naturally participating in the topics that interested the pupils. However, situations also occurred where I was positioned as a linguistic expert in Swedish because of the research-related vocabulary I was using. Thus, I consider being a non-native speaker as an additional dimension in negotiating power relations between the participants and the researcher. In these

negotiations, power relations related to both academic and linguistic knowledge intertwine.

Some sixth-grade boys are crowding at the carpentry classroom door, all prepared to rush out for the weekend. Tomas is pointing to Swedish- and Finnish-speaking signs on the door, which remind everyone to clean up after themselves. Tomas asks me: Which one is better, Swedish or Finnish? I reply by saying that I like Swedish language a lot but on the other hand I know Finnish better. (—) Tomas: But you know words that even I don't! Tuuli: Such as? Tomas: Well, for example inter— Tomas disappears into the corridor with the noisy bunch before finishing his sentence (Fieldnotes, Swedish-speaking school in Finland, November, 2014, orig. written in Finnish and Swedish, conversation in Swedish).

In this excerpt, a variety of linguistic power relations are under negotiation, which would have required more sensitivity from the researcher. At first, by replying to Tomas' question about the rivalry between Finnish and Swedish, instead of questioning its necessity, I end up participating in the construction of an understanding that languages can be placed in such hierarchies. Later on that occasion, the word Tomas is probably referring to is interviewing, which was considered among the pupils as a central but rather mysterious task of mine as a researcher participating in their school's daily life. Considering the power relations between the researcher and the participants, this encounter illuminates the multiple voices and stances in these negotiations, both academic and linguistic. At the same time, the researcher can be positioned as an outsider or between two linguistic realities while possessing some linguistic knowledge that the pupils are not considered to possess even in their own native language.

Beside the informal encounters during the participant observation, issues related to language choice and linguistic positioning were also present during the photo-elicitation tasks and interviews with pupils. At times I found it hard to describe the photo-elicitation task to the pupils in Swedish in a nuanced way that would make it sound appealing to them. Moreover, the language choices some of the pupils made while writing about their photos or participating in the interviews made me reflect on how they experienced the power relations between us and my linguistic position as a researcher. At the beginning of the interviews it was emphasised to the pupils that they could use Swedish or Finnish however they liked. In Finland, the language of the interviews was typically aligned with the language of the institution, i.e., the language that I was mostly using to communicate with the pupils within that particular school. Two of the bilingual pupils in the Swedish-speaking class wanted to use Finnish in the interview, even though we typically spoke Swedish to each other in the classroom context, particularly when

there were other pupils around. The interviews became discursive spaces in which linguistic positioning had a different dynamic from that during a regular school day. In Finland, the interviews were conducted in a small office of the Swedish-speaking school, which the pupils normally did not have regular access to. Moreover, for the pupils in the Finnish-speaking school, the interview also took place along a corridor they rarely visited, which seemed to provoke curiosity in some of them. Somehow, the spatial configuration of the interview situations also had an impact on the defaults of language management in each school, which I had also acquired. In Sweden, the power relations related to language choice and linguistic positioning with the pupils were more complicated. Aligning with the bilingual agenda particularly promoting the Finnish language, the pupils probably related the task to school work. Thus, almost all the pupils ended up writing the descriptions of their photos in Finnish, even if Swedish for many of them was the language they mostly related to. Looking back on it, I could have paid more attention to presenting the photography-task as detached from their regular schoolwork and the related expectations of performing as a pupil.

In this chapter, I have presented the research process and the methodological considerations influencing this study. By means of a thorough reflection of the ethnographical choices and points of departure related to this study, I have also aimed to contribute to the methodological discussion in the field of school ethnography and deal with the questions that were given less attention in the articles included in this thesis. I will now proceed to presenting and discussing the findings of this study.

5 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The main results of the three articles are summarised in this chapter. The relations between spatial ideologies concerning language and education and spatial practices in educational institutions are analysed in the articles of this dissertation.

5.1 Article I: Shared places, separate spaces: Constructing cultural spaces through two national languages in Finland

Article I, *Shared places, separate spaces: Constructing cultural spaces through two national languages in Finland*, provides a spatial analytical perspective on the discourses and practices related to Swedish-speaking education in Finland. The article aims at deconstructing the hegemonic understanding of monolingualism and spatial separation as necessary for the protection of the Swedish language and culture in Finland. Feminist and post-structural theories on difference-making as well as spatial theorisation are deployed to construct an idea of cultural space as an analytical tool. Cultural space is introduced as a concept that pulls together the intersecting dimensions of difference, such as language, ethnicity and social class that are constructed in educational discourse and practice. These discourses and practices are analysed in relation to social categories and subject positions, through which spaces of segregation and inclusion are constructed. The data consists of texts published in Finnish newspapers, transcripts of video-ethnographic data from a co-located high school campus and interviews with teaching staff at five co-located school campuses, produced during the *Språkmöten* project.

The article concludes that in the construction of cultural spaces, spatiality manifests itself both as symbolic and material. In the debates concerning Swedish-speaking education in Finland, the concept of space gains significance both as a metaphor for power and autonomy as well as the physical organisation of education, particularly the shared buildings of Swedish- and Finnish-speaking schools. The discourse promoting spatial separation in the Swedish-speaking schooling in Finland is an ideological construct, through which Swedish in Finland is perceived as a historically, linguistically, socially and culturally distinguished space of its own. According to the analyses of public debate, cultural spaces tend to build on an essentialist understanding of linguistic categories, which enables a dichotomous discourse of two separate worlds in relation to the national languages in Finland, as well as dispelling any other form of linguistic diversity outside this dichotomy. The Swedish-speaking school institution, as a mental, social and physical space, was often presented in the public debate as serving the aims of this separation. In co-located schools too, the architecture and design were seen as connected to spatial practices in how they shaped the social spaces of the teaching

staff, pupils and students, either enabling or hindering co-operation between the schools. The Swedish- and Finnish-speaking students of a co-located high school campus named and navigated their physical and social school space in relation to these linguistic categories but hardly ever seemed to cross the boundaries or social spaces in their daily interaction. This created a pattern of linguistic and cultural otherisation, in which *the other* was often referred to, but not encountered. This article also sheds light on how the spatially determined subject positions are negotiated and resisted particularly in relation to mono- and bilingualism.

5.2 Article II: Language crashes and shifting orientations: the construction and negotiation of linguistic value in bilingual school spaces in Finland and Sweden

Article II, Language crashes and shifting orientations: the construction and negotiation of linguistic value in bilingual school spaces in Finland and Sweden deals with the valuation of language and linguistic resources in different discourses and their connection to spatial ideologies in education. The data used for this article consists of participatory observations, photo-elicitation interviews with pupils and individual interviews with the school personnel in the co-located field schools in Finland and the bilingual field school in Sweden. In the analysis, space is approached first and foremost as a discursive and symbolic construct but their manifestation in terms of the possession and management of physical or material school space is also scrutinised. The main analytical tools in this article are Richard Ruiz's (1984) classifications of language policy orientation into rights, resources and problems, which have been considered as a basis for linguistic valuation in language policy studies. In this article, moreover, the orientations are employed as a foundation for the spatial ideologies that define the spatial hierarchies of languages in educational systems. The aim is to shed light on how the value of language is constructed in the interplay between policy discourses and educational practices with regard to the organisation of educational spaces and spatial autonomy. Moreover, the analysis focuses on what kinds of spatial dimension linguistic hierarchies carry in these schools and how the speakers are positioned in these hierarchies in terms of their linguistic resources. Given its historical and political contextuality and discrepancy, this article provides ethnographic evidence of how linguistic value is connected to time and space at a variety of levels.

Ethnography provides access to a variety of negotiations of the valuation, recognition of linguistic resources and the spatial relationality of these processes. In none of the schools was bilingualism a self-evident resource for the pupils but was subject to constant, spatially and temporally situated negotiations in which a variety of linguistic, cultural, and social difference-making was present. Linguistic resources were most obviously recognised by the pupils as a personal benefit rather than linguistic capital that might for instance provide access to the labour

market. Among the pupils in both countries, the most unambiguous way of attaching value to linguistic resources seemed to be communication with peers at school, whereas the worth of bilingualism in society was not as self-evident for them. Teachers were typically the ones to promote a discourse on the material and instrumental benefits of knowing a language, such as internationalisation, the labour market and further education, and sometimes these discourses were also echoed in pupils' talk, particularly in the bilingual school in Sweden. In Finland, the knowledge of both national languages was recognised as a resource in a co-located school, where it could be used to communicate and get acquainted with the pupils on "the other side". The staff and also some of the pupils in the Finnish-speaking school particularly showed interest in Swedish as a useful linguistic resource in Finland and the Nordic countries. Similarly, the pupils often articulated the lack of knowledge of the national languages as a hindrance to communicate with the pupils in the neighbouring school. Thus, language was recognised in the pupils' talk as a difference that contributed to the physical and social separation of the school space. However, language was also understood above all as having the potential to shape and reorganise the segregation of social spaces.

Despite the diminishing stigma on the Sweden Finns in Sweden, the recognition of Finnish as a valuable resource was still hindered by classed, devaluing attributes in places, whereas Swedish in Finland was most often seen as a prestigious resource among other language groups as well. The gradual shift in the increasing amount of Swedish as the language of instruction in bilingual schools can be considered as a spatial practice exerting an influence on the linguistic hierarchy of the school. Along with this shift, Finnish was further pushed to the margins of the formal school space and towards the personal sphere of the pupils in the school in Sweden. Another symptom of the spatial hierarchy between Swedish and Finnish was the lack of competence in Finnish of many of the staff members and how it was not presented as problematic but more utilised as a source of humour. Most importantly, this article shows that the value of language seems to be connected to the justification of spatial separation as a means of protecting a language that is labelled as a minority language in a particular national or local context. A certain cultural value related to the Swedish language in Finland, constructed through its historical and social prestige and legitimised by the official language policy status, seems to justify a monolingual norm in Swedish-medium education rather than the promotion of linguistic diversity, including in co-located schools. In the bilingual school in Sweden, however, the justification of a separate school for instruction in Finnish and Swedish had to rely on arguments that were first and foremost related to language being beneficial in economic and other instrumental terms. This can be understood as reflecting not only the socio-historical status of Finnish but also the commodification and marketisation of language and education policies in Sweden, and particularly in independent schools.

5.3 Article III: ‘We are two languages here’: The operation of language policies through spatial ideologies and practices in a co-located and a bilingual school

Article III, ‘We are two languages here’: The operation of language policies through spatial ideologies and practices in a co-located and a bilingual school, approaches the meanings given to mental, social and material space in the process of language management and separation in co-located schools in Finland and bilingual education in Sweden. The analytical framework combines an ethnographic understanding with post-structuralist notions of language, space and power. The concept of spatial ideology is suggested in order to determine how the understanding of space is articulated in relation to language policies in education. Furthermore, the article deals with how these ideologies are put into practice and negotiated in the discourses and practices of educational institutions.

When it comes to Swedish-speaking education in Finland, the findings of this article support the observations made in Article I. A spatial ideology promoting spatial separation of the national languages in education as a means for protecting the Swedish language and culture was reproduced, particularly in the Swedish-speaking school in Finland. Interestingly, the spatial policy of the co-location also seemed to question and reformulate the rationality of language separation. As a material and social space, the co-located schools were also considered to provide alternative ways of promoting linguistic diversity. Linguistic diversity was, however, typically understood as consisting of Finnish-Swedish bilingualism and not so much reflected in relation to other languages. Moreover, even the positive views on bilingual practices or co-operation between co-located schools seemed to rely on the idea of a monolingual pupil subject. A spatial ideology promoting language separation or monolingualism in the bilingual school in Sweden was not as self-evidently present as in Finland. This obviously derives from the school’s bilingual curriculum and educational task as well as the official language policy status of Swedish as the country’s main language. Notwithstanding, the absence of this discourse in Sweden should be considered as implying more subtle societal power relations. Even if monolingualism and separation were not legitimised through an official language policy discourse as in Finland, these ideals were presented and promoted through a variety of spatial conceptualisations and practices by the teaching staff. Firstly, a separate physical school dedicated to Finnish-medium education was considered as providing continuity in the rather abstract and unstable language policy conditions. Secondly, the power relations between the official languages of the bilingual school were considered as managed by means of a variety of spatial practices, in order to prevent Swedish from “taking over”.

In general, the findings of Article III reflect a common knowledge of spatial separation or compartmentalisation as a way of managing languages in education, which can be considered to reflect the monolingual habitus of schooling reproduced in linguistically diverse environments. The findings show that the construction of educational spaces through different techniques of linguistic management relies strongly on a fixed notion of language as a bounded entity and a rather essentialist view of linguistic and cultural categories and identities. This might be a result of the language policy discourse, which constructs its objects as bounded and contextualised systems and places them in certain institutional orders within a nation-space. The view of language as countable entities also forms a basis for language governance in policy and management in school spaces. It enables the creation of hierarchies and linguistic categories that allow for the separation of social spaces in order to control language practices, allocating particular physical, social and mental spaces for particular languages.

6 DISCUSSION

In the final chapter of this dissertation, I shall discuss the findings of my research in relation to the research interests explained in the introduction. I shall begin by dealing with the discursive meanings ascribed to space in the making of language policies in education (RQ1). I then proceed to reflect on the implications of these discourses in the construction of spatial orders and subject positions in education through the ethnographic findings (RQ2 and RQ3). Moreover, the findings are then examined in relation to broader contemporary tendencies in educational policies in Finland and Sweden. Finally, I shall return to the central suggestion of this dissertation, that of analysing language policies in education as the politics of space.

6.1 Cultural spaces and spatial ideologies as approaches to language policy, spatiality and power in education

A central interest of this study has been to investigate the ways in which space is understood, conceptualised and discussed in the context of language and education. Public debates on physical school space, while being concrete, tangible and in many ways unambiguous, have provided an entry point for analysing these discourses on language policy, spatiality and power. These discourses are not only descriptive but also performative in how they attempt to embed and naturalise particular ways of seeing. Thus, spatial practices are a part of what is seen as constituting discourse (Richardson & Jensen, 2003) and invisibly imposed discourses across space define the appropriate behaviours for particular spaces (Valentine, 2001). An example of a discourse of spatiality and its material implications, spatial practices in this context, is the separation of the national languages in the Finnish language policy and institutional education. References to physical space have been increasingly present in the discussion of Swedish-speaking education in Finland during the past decade and have included perspectives on school architecture, school buildings and facilities, their design, organisation and appropriation. This study has been sparked by my interest in learning more about the underlying power relations in these disputes and in the spatiality of language policies in a broader context. Therefore, the title of the dissertation, “Speaking of space”, not only refers to the significance of a spatial understanding in educational language policy contexts but also to the ways in which the ideology of monolingual space and spatial separation are embedded in the debates as self-evident but hardly ever examined further. While speaking of space, other interests and power relations often begin to unfold as well. In the mainstream discussions of Finnish-speaking education in Sweden, a spatial rhetoric has not been as explicit or politicised but

the analysis of the discourses of Swedish in Finland has proved to offer a reflective surface for the purposes of this study. The ideological constructs discussed in this study are reflected in the conceptualisations of space. The contention concerning language practices in physical school space, educational design and architecture are often justified using a pragmatic rhetoric. However, the findings of this study show that these arguments are embedded in the societal and historical layers of language ideology and policy discourses. The purpose of this dissertation has been a deconstruction of these discourses in order to reveal the power relations in the construction of the norms related to language and school space, reproduced through language policies and popular discourses of language in education. In Article I, this construct is conceptualised as cultural space, whereas in Article III the concept of spatial ideology is used for a similar analytical purpose.

In Article I, the concept of cultural space has been suggested and applied as an analytical tool in order to connect the discursive and material, interrelated dimensions of space constructed in the policy and practice related to the parallel schools for the national languages in Finland. In the co-located schools in Finland, the language policies aiming at the separation of Finnish and Swedish manifest themselves as spatial and temporal governance or control. The physical space – architecture, the design, use and organisation of space – is not only utilised to manage and separate the national languages according to the legislative requirements but also shaped and influenced by a hegemonic understanding of the necessity of monolingual space in Swedish-medium education in Finland. This understanding is a multi-layered construct of cultural, historical and political discourses that have intertwined during the era of the Finnish nation-state and can therefore be thought of as a spatial ideology. Recently, a more general concern over the rapid transformation of traditional learning environments has entered the discussion of co-located schools in Finland from the Swedish-speaking side (Lönnqvist, 2019). Thus, in the arguments against co-locations, language policy aspects merge with more general debates on learning spaces and the topic of sharing space becomes a venue for an abundance of often conflicting interests. In Article III, the notion of spatial ideology may show the normative understandings of how language should be spatially managed in institutional education both in Finland and Sweden. The notion is connected particularly to the rationales of linguistic management, according to which some languages should be kept separate in educational practice. Moreover, spatial ideologies are related to the hegemonic understandings of the conditions under which linguistic diversity forms a threat to a minority language. These spatial ideologies can be distinguished by looking at the ways in which space is both conceptualised and practised in everyday schooling.

As pointed out in Article I, a re-organisation of the physical school and the partial abolition of the spatial separation of the national languages in the co-located schools in Finland also interrupts the norm of spatial separation as a mental

construct and, furthermore, suggests a new kind of language ideological understanding. Without this socio-historically and politically constructed spatial ideology, both the establishment of co-located schools and the plans for actual bilingual schools with instruction in Finnish and Swedish would most likely have provoked less opposition or critical dispute. Moreover, without this kind of dominant spatial ideology, the ethnographic observations of everyday life in co-located schools would presumably tell a story rather different from what it does in this study. In Sweden, instead, the absence of a similar established spatial ideology concerning Finnish in Sweden's educational spaces is reflected in the language policy discourses that participate in defining the thinkable ways of organising Finnish-medium education. Socio-historical discourses position Swedish as the main language for reproducing societal cohesion in Swedish society (Hult, 2004). Moreover, these discourses constrain the normalisation of separate minority language spaces as a way of protecting marginalised languages. This resonates in the organisation of education in Finnish as a spatial matter; Finnish-medium education is available in bilingual schools, where the balance between the minority and majority language is governed through education and language policies. While this might well be presented as rational in a society where a proficiency in Swedish is required for further study and working life, a closer examination of the everyday practices in one of these bilingual schools provides a more nuanced and a rather problematic picture of the prevailing linguistic power relations. Despite the many dedicated educators and their continuous striving to make space for Finnish also outside the official bilingual curriculum, in many instances the one of the two official languages of instruction that ends up marginalised and devalued is Finnish. Even if Finnish is to a great extent used as a language of instruction particularly in the lower classes, it is gradually replaced by Swedish both in the curriculum and in the social spaces of the school. This also reflects the opposite goals of national language management and underlying power relations in the two studied contexts. In the Swedish context, the linguistic space for Finnish is being managed and decreased in the name of academic achievement and integration, while in Finland a monolingual space for Swedish is justified as a necessary means in order to protect the *de facto* minority language.

This study has particularly aimed to observe the spatialisation and materialisation of what Heller (2006, 5) has termed *parallel monolingualisms*, and how the separation of languages is constructed and carried out in spatial terms. The implication is that the question of how to overcome the obstacles hindering bilingualism and linguistic diversity in education remains. These obstacles are not only practical or pedagogical but also ideological or discursive. Heller (2011, 20) points out language as a constitutive element of social processes. This, she continues, implies an understanding that struggles about language might fundamentally be about other things, since minority positions are typically entangled with a variety of societal power relations. Like linguistic norms in school institutions,

spatial ideologies related to language management can also be considered as the minority's struggles for power (see also Heller, 2006). However, there is a need to display sensitivity towards the imaginaries, categorisations and subject positions they maintain. In their respective national and cultural contexts, both Swedish-speaking Finns and Sweden Finns are groups that are the subject of many linguistic and cultural stereotypes intertwined with socio-historical power relations and statuses. Particularly in the Sweden Finnish school, the presence of social class in the teacher discourses and its perceived connection to language resources and their materialization, for example, the perceived usability of Finnish language in further studies and the labour market was prominent. In this study, I have suggested that the analysis of spatial discourses and practices in education might offer new potential to understand the inequalities in the distribution of linguistic resources and the connection between language and social differentiation.

6.2 Negotiation of language boundaries, hierarchies and subject positions in everyday schooling

In this dissertation, the spatiality of language policies has been considered as processes through which language policies in education gain spatial dimensions and contribute to the construction of spatial orders of school institutions. The construction of linguistic boundaries and language hierarchies provides an example of the spatiality of language policies in educational discourse and practice. These boundaries and hierarchies can manifest themselves as material or symbolic. The construction of linguistic boundaries and hierarchies can be observed through the processes of place-making in educational discourse and in everyday school life. At the core of the construction of places is the continuous re-articulation of their symbolic value in political discourse, which contributes to the creation of linguistic hierarchies in nation spaces (see also Massey, 2005). This has been particularly prominent in the recent debates on the history and future prospects of Swedish-speaking schools in Finland. Moreover, in educational practices and among the social spaces of pupils, these boundaries and hierarchies gain material qualities and shape the spatial orders of school life. The process of place-making in children's everyday spaces in and outside school implies the construction of a boundary through which the identification of what is left on the other side is enabled (Gustafson, 2006). These linguistic boundaries often seem to align with the material and mental boundaries of the institution but, as seen in this study, just as often linguistic boundaries are being reconstructed as temporal and relational through constant negotiation as well as social and linguistic difference-making in the everyday practices of the institutions.

As also seen in this study, often the basis for the construction of spatialised linguistic boundaries is the articulation of an essential difference between lan-

guage groups and related identities. The articulation of linguistic boundaries typically participates in the construction of belonging and otherisation. These processes often have both intentional and unintentional spatial implications in everyday education. In school institutions, the idealisation of monolingual space as a way of nurturing linguistic vitality further enables the construction of a boundary, on the other side of which “the other” is positioned. This becomes particularly material and tangible in co-located school campuses, where the physical spaces are typically organised in accordance with the official languages of the institutions sharing the facilities. Further, the physical division between the institutions contributes to social spaces and the time-space paths of the pupils are constructed through the same division. In this study, I have conceptualised this dynamic as a form of linguistic governance, the explicit aim of which is to protect Swedish language in co-located schools in Finland. However, as pointed out here, it can be stated to have also other outcomes.

Linguistic hierarchies can be observed as an outcome of linguistic governance in terms of how language is valued or de-valued in particular contexts (Manan et. al 2016). The orientations to language policy and planning (Ruiz, 1984; Vuorsola, 2019) define what is thinkable about the symbolic and instrumental value of language in a particular context. The orientations function as a basis for the construction of linguistic hierarchies, which manifest themselves spatially in the everyday life of the schools, where they have an impact on where and on what occasions languages are recognised as useful or valuable. This shows, for example, in how Swedish was positioned as the primary academic language in the bilingual school in Sweden, whereas Finnish was considered as secondary or informal in many instances. This, in turn, is connected to the historical problem orientation towards the Finnish language in Swedish society. Even if the problem orientation in seems to be slowly shifting into the recognition of Finnish as a resource in public discourse and attitudes, the structural problems related to the educational rights remain. In the ethnographic data, the value of language was mainly constructed through the orientation which (dis-)recognises languages as resources and (de-)values them as different types of linguistic capital in terms of an economic rationality. In line with this, language was particularly discussed in relation to its potential value for internationalisation, Nordic co-operation and expanded opportunities in the labour market. In the case of Swedish in Finland, a discourse on the valuation of Swedish as a historically and culturally established part of the Finnish nation-state was to be distinguished in the material. Despite this discourse promoting Swedish as a form of cultural capital, its necessity was also justified through commodification, the potential of converting language proficiency into material resources in a capitalist system (see e.g. Heller, 2010). In Sweden, the shift in educational policies towards a market orientation enabling such mechanisms as free school choice were particularly well reflected in the ethnographic

data from the bilingual school. The status of Finnish as a national minority language or the understanding of a language as a comprehensive right are promoted in the national legislation but a similar justification did not prove as powerful in the discourses and practices of the school. One reason for this seemed to be the overpowering discourse of language as a resource, which has to prove its instrumental value beyond the rationale of language as a fundamental human right.

Language policy spaces in schools are a result of language-related hierarchies and boundaries, in the construction of which, a variety of differences – linguistic, classed, gendered, ethnicised – come together. Within these spaces, an understanding of an ideal linguistic subjectivity, the speaker of a language, is created. The monolingual habitus of schooling (Piller, 2016) also establishes premises for the subject positions available to the pupils and adults in school. The conceptualisation of a monolingual space enables the construction of a monolingual subject. The monolingual norm of the pupils is mediated for instance through spatial ideologies that present monolingual spaces as the ideal solution for protecting a minority language and is reproduced through spatial practices that aim at implementing this kind of ideology.

Spatial ideologies related to language management by means of spatial separation were both manifested and challenged in the co-located schools and the bilingual school in Sweden. As a spatial arrangement, the co-located schools seemed to question the norm of linguistic separation and language management striving towards a monolingual norm. However, sometimes the near proximity of the Finnish-speaking school was considered as a motive for increasing control, particularly in relation to the “informal school”, i.e. the breaks and time spent outside the curricular activities (Gordon et. al. 2006). The negotiation of these practices and their justification was an on-going process, embedded both in the daily routines and in the discussions where they were reflected upon. Both in the Swedish- and Finnish-medium schools of the co-located campus, the dominant norm seemed to be a monolingual pupil speaking and identifying with the official language of their school. As many of the pupils and families in this particular region only used the language of the school at home, the monolingual norm did not appear problematic in many instances. However, the spatial separation and the linguistic dichotomy through which it was materialised seemed to trigger many of the pupils to ponder on and question the subject positions that were available to them and their peers in the language policy discourses of the co-located campus. This not only concerned those pupils in the Swedish-medium class who spoke both Swedish and Finnish at home. Many of the “monolingual” pupils, particularly in the Finnish-speaking school as well, criticised the linguistic categories shaped along with the official language of the schools for being narrow and reductive. Moreover, the pupils were aware of the social and spatial implications of these categories in their everyday lives. Thus, resistance towards the given subject positions and presumed

linguistic resources took place among both those who were positioned as monolingual and those positioned as bilingual along with the official languages of the school(s).

The measures that are required in order to account for the linguistic diversity within Swedish-speaking schools in Finland are also identified in a recent report by the Finnish Education Evaluation Centre (Hellgren, Silverström, Lepola, Forsman & Slotte, 2019). The report points out that the linguistic variation between Swedish-speaking schools is significant and the pedagogical resources vary locally, which can be considered as another dimension of the spatial power relations taking place in the making of language policies. Not all schools have the opportunity to offer linguistic support for the increasing number of pupils who also speak Finnish or other languages at home. This is obviously first and foremost an issue related to the spatial distribution of material resources in education, but in the light of this thesis it can also be suspected that the still prevailing ideology of Swedish-speaking schools as monolingual spaces has to some extent hindered the discussion of the pedagogical need arising from linguistic diversity within Swedish-speaking education in Finland.

The use of spatial and material practices has also been pointed out in previous studies as strategies for managing power relations and separating languages in bilingual education (see also Hadi-Tabassum, 2006; Martín-Bylund, 2017). In the bilingual school in Sweden too, spatial practices were presented as essential in creating a material and symbolic space for Finnish in everyday life. The spatial practices were often carried out by using material artefacts to create linguistic boundaries and by allocating certain time-spaces to the use of Finnish. Central spatial practices were routine and repetition, as well as segmenting and structuring spaces. Among pupils, the spatial power relations between the institutional languages were present particularly during negotiations over the “right”, “allowed” or “necessary” language in certain situations and spaces. Through these negotiations, the pupils were positioned in relation to their linguistic resources, language choices or language identities in the linguistic spaces of the school. Instead of being fixed, these positions were in constant flux. Thus, the linguistic spaces and the subject positions offered within them were relational and under constant negotiation. In the construction of these spaces, however, the official languages of the institution seem to be dominant, even if negotiations were not restricted to the “official school” (see Gordon et al. 2000). In the curricular activities and teacher discourses, the subject positions seemed to be formulated mostly in relation to the official languages of the school or, in the case of the co-located schools, the school campus. Thus, in the bilingual school in Sweden, the normative linguistic repertoire was either Finnish, Swedish or a combination of these two. The pupils’ other linguistic resources or the languages they spoke outside school were seldom given any recognition at school. Similarly, in Finland, the pupils’ linguistic repertoire was most often presented as monolingual Finnish or Swedish, and only the few

pupils in the Swedish-medium class who also spoke Finnish at home represented linguistic diversity.

6.3 Language and spatiality in the recent tendencies of education policies in Finland and Sweden

The contemporary education policies in Finland and Sweden provide the national contexts for this dissertation and define the framework and political conditions, within which language education policies and educational language rights are carried out. Therefore, the implementation of language policies in education in Finland and Sweden need to be considered in relation to the contemporary traits of Nordic educational policies and institutional education. Despite the divergent contemporary policies and the increasing marketisation of the welfare system, it may still be argued that the idea of citizenship in the Nordic countries builds upon discursively shared values of equality, democracy and welfare (Holm, 2018b.). These values cover the principles of social and educational policies and are manifest in the idea of universal provision of welfare and education. However, the realisation of a Nordic model, which considers that the educational system is to provide the same for everyone regardless of social background and location is increasingly being questioned in educational research. It has been pointed out by a number of researchers that Nordic societies and their educational systems are experiencing a shift towards a neoliberal paradigm and a new way of governing along with the tendencies to marketisation, deregulation and privatisation (Arnesen & Lundahl 2006; Beach, 2018; Dovemark et al. 2018; Lundahl, 2016). Some of these tendencies do also appear in the educational system and education policies in Finland, yet not to the same extent as in Sweden. The number of private providers of education is restricted and, unlike in Sweden, they are not allowed to extract profits (Dovemark et al. 2018; Lundahl, 2016). However, some characteristics of marketisation and deregulation can be distinguished even within the public school system, manifesting themselves particularly in the increased range of parental choice. The opportunity to choose a school outside one's neighbourhood area has also increased educational divisions and segregation in Finland (Varjo et al. 2015).

The current tendencies in the Nordic educational policies also touch upon the realisation of social inclusion in terms of language, albeit their connection has received relatively little attention in the research on language and education. In addition to socio-economic background, ethnicity, religion and other social differences between pupils, language is considered as one of the factors that should not contribute to marginalisation in the educational system (Holm, 2018b.). In practice, the availability of either mother tongue instruction or bilingual instruction has been pointed out as central in providing minority language speakers' equal access to education (Lainio, 2017; Baker, 2017). With regard to the equal access to bilingual education, the position of the Sweden Finnish independent

schools as providers of Finnish-medium education is unpredictable. The findings of this study suggest that the problem has a specific connection to the policy and practice of free school choice. As also Vuorsola (2019) has noted, Sweden Finnish independent schools are obliged to compete with the municipal schools in the same area. In this set-up, the bilingual programs offered are only one of the many aspects of the wider mechanisms of school choice. In my ethnographic data, both pupils and staff of the Sweden Finnish school presented a variety of factors as relevant in choosing a school, such as modern facilities and the latest learning technology (From, 2019). Furthermore, the critique concerning school segregation in Sweden, accelerated by geographical segregation and policies promoting free school choice, has also been pointed out by a recent report by UNICEF (2018). As Lundahl (2016, 9) suggests, referring to the body of research conducted on the topic, “the marketisation of education in Sweden is not just an innocent, administrative matter; it affects most aspects of education and schools profoundly – socially, economically, academically and professionally. It changes the relationships between actors in school and their pedagogical identities”. However, Lundahl, Erixon Arreman, Holm and Lundström (2013) also point out that so far only a few studies highlight the ways in which the external marketisation affects the schools’ internal work and life. This study has illustrated some of the material and social consequences of the recent education policies that touch upon daily educational realities, particularly in the Swedish context.

During the educational reforms in Sweden, freedom of school choice for parents and competition between schools have been articulated as features of a free society and understood as improving the quality of education (Fjellman, 2019). However, as Dovemark and others (2018) point out, the introduction of deregulation, privatisation and marketisation in education has had the opposite effect in terms of quality, resulting in spatial segregation and differentiation in and between schools not only in Sweden but also increasingly in Finland. In the context of language education in Finland, parental school choice has been connected to various language education programmes, such as bilingual and foreign language programmes, typically organised in classes with selective enrolment within public schools. This development has been shown to contribute to differentiation and segregation within and between schools, creating subtle market tendencies and influencing educational discourses and practices within public systems (Kosunen, 2016; Rajander, 2010). In this light, co-located schools as mainstream public schools would have the potential to provide an inclusive learning environment and an alternative for selective bilingual programmes. However, this would require political will, additional resources and determined pedagogies in the co-located campuses.

The most explicit influence of neo-liberal policies in the context of language and education might be the shift in the language policy rationales from language rights to viewing language as a resource and a commodity, which the ethnographic

data of this study has also clearly illustrated. The impact of the weakening of the nation-state on language policy should be considered in relation to how it might affect the governmental policies intended to protect or manage minority languages. Even if some researchers consider it as promoting multilingualism and the empowerment of linguistic minorities, neo-liberalism can also be seen as compelling minorities to compete more in the global market (Cardinal & Denault, 2007). A connection between the promotion of multilingualism and a neo-liberal subject of a lifelong learner and a flexible worker can also be made (Flores, 2017). This connection further ties the value of language to its material and instrumental worth instead of its intrinsic value. However, neoliberal discourses of language resources have also shown to be quick to relocate. Hult and Pietikäinen (2014) have pointed out how in the neoliberally oriented societal debates of mandatory Swedish in Finnish-speaking schools, Swedish has typically been positioned as a problem eroding individual freedom of choice whereas English has been considered as a resource serving the market economy. This study has showed that in some of the more recent ideological debates, neoliberal logic has entered the arguments for bilingual school spaces and turned Swedish into a similar resource as well.

6.4 Analysing language policies as the politics of space

The meanings ascribed to space contribute to spatial ideologies that define what is thinkable about the implementation of language policies and the management of languages in school institutions. The value and political identity of a school as a place is a result of spatial conceptualisations, such as the articulation of material and social boundaries framing those spaces (Hadi-Tabassum, 2006). The various dimensions of space intertwine in the articulation of spatial ideologies. As seen in this study, space gains meanings as symbolic, relational, as entangled with temporal qualities, and very often as concrete and material as well (Lefebvre, 1991; Massey, 2005). Physical space is represented as framing and structuring not only the daily practices but also essentially promoting a sense of linguistic continuity, particularly under uncertain or controversial language policy conditions. By observing the meanings attributed to the very material and concrete space, i.e., architecture and the conventional components of a school building in a language policy context, as well as the spatial practices reconstructed in these contexts, it is possible to uncover a network of socio-historical power relations contributing to these understandings. Blommaert (2013, 3) describes the traces of power inscribed in the use of physical space as follows:

Physical space is also social, cultural and political space: a space that offers, enables, triggers, invites, prescribes, proscribes, polices or enforces certain patterns of social behavior: a space that is never no-man's land, but always somebody's space: a historical space, therefore, full of codes,

expectations, norms and traditions; and a space of power controlled by, as well as controlling, people.

In the context of this study, the spatial ideologies and practices also inevitably become political and strategic, since the schools are considered to serve a political and societal agenda in sheltering the minority language from linguistic power dominance in society. Particularly in the case of the co-located schools in Finland, spatial (both material and social) practices can also challenge the prevailing spatial ideology of linguistic separation and encourage the deconstruction of linguistic boundaries. Despite the monolingual habitus of schooling manifesting itself in the principles and practices of language management also in bilingual settings, this study shows that the discourse concerning the necessity of a monolingual space in the context of minority language education is not universal or self-evident but a context-bound historical and political construct, which also involves a certain privilege in terms of the societal status of a language. Despite the common paradigm of language separation and the fear of mixing minority and majority languages in institutional education, their spatial outcomes are not the same everywhere but infused with power relations contributing to social differentiation.

Spatial management of language in education contributes to a paradigm of linguistic governance, where languages continue to be considered and reconstructed as separate, countable entities or systems (see Makoni & Mashiri, 2007; Makoni & Pennycook). The language hierarchies and categorisations in the national language policies rely on a similar understanding, through which linguistic power relations in societies and their educational institutions are justified (Nikula et al., 2012). The policy statuses of Swedish as a national language in Finland and Finnish as a national minority language in Sweden are reflected in how the spatial premises of education are determined and negotiated in each context. This understanding presents the prevailing linguistic conditions as governable and enables the management of linguistic diversity through the management of spatial discourses and practices. Moreover, it enables the reconstruction of linguistic hierarchies through spatial practices by allocating certain spaces in educational systems for particular languages based on their recognition in national language policies and granting them a certain amount of spatial autonomy. The school is an institution where the linguistic hierarchies created through national language policies have spatial consequences that manifest themselves both materially and socially. In many ways, the question of organising education in Swedish in Finland and in Finnish in Sweden touches upon spatial policies and has to do with power and claiming spaces. The reconstruction of linguistic boundaries within the nation state is carried out with the help of institutions as symbolic and material constructions. In both countries, the construction of linguistic spaces in education takes place in the encounters between language and education policies, which also have consequences in the material preconditions of everyday education.

Doreen Massey (2005) points out the spatial as inevitably political. Space has become explicitly politicised in the debates related to language and education particularly concerning the position of Swedish in Finland. This is manifested in how the contention over the use and possession of space in education have become venues for intersecting interests and power struggles. In the debates concerning bilingual educational solutions for the national languages in Finland, space, in a symbolic and material sense, has become both an object of and a tool for making language policies, and something that is constructed along with these. The politics of language and space also have implications for educational equality. Corson (2001, 32) suggests that the realisation of social justice and linguistic rights through language education policy would require that children should be guaranteed the right to be educated in the language learned at home or valued most by them or at least the right to attend a school that shows full respect for this language by encouraging its use, even if it was not the language of instruction, and that children ought to be guaranteed a right to gain full proficiency in the regional standard language variety. In the light of this study, this would also require a reformulation of the rationalities underlying the ideology of spatial separation as a means for language management. Moreover, given the recent market tendencies in education policies discussed in this study, it is appropriate to consider language as a crucial factor in spatial differentiation of schooling.

The spatial outcomes of language and education policies not only touch upon the regional segregation or availability of education in national or minority languages but also manifest themselves in material and social spaces, hierarchies, and boundaries in the everyday lives of schools. Therefore, also the theoretical and analytical scope of the spatial lens in this study is broad; it encompasses the material, social, cultural, mental aspects of space, language policy discourse, the everyday practices and the interplay between them. This study challenges the idea of language separation as a spatial ideology and practice and problematises language management based on the idea of monolingual spaces, such as *svenska rum*. Instead, it provides a focus on the complex negotiations of linguistic power relations inside material school spaces. These negotiations have been shown to be parallel to broader language and education policy developments in education and the discursive spaces they construct. This examination has revealed a more nuanced picture of linguistic belonging and marginalisation for the purposes of making inclusive language policies than the essentialisation of space.

REFERENCES

- Aitken, S. (2001). *Geographies of young people: The morally contested spaces of identity*. London: Routledge.
- Alexiadou, N., Dovemark, M., Erixon-Arreman, I., Holm, A.-S., Lundahl, L., & Lundström, U. (2016). Managing inclusion in competitive school systems: The cases of Sweden and England. *Research in Comparative & International Education*, 11(1), 13–33.
- Alisaari, J., Heikkola, L. M., Commins, N., & Acquah, W. O. (2019). Monolingual ideologies confronting multilingual realities. Finnish teachers' beliefs about linguistic diversity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 80, 48–58.
- Arnesen, A.-L., Lahelma, E., Lundahl, L., Öhrn, E. (2014). Unfolding the context and the contents: Critical perspectives on contemporary Nordic schooling. In: A.-L. Arnesen, E. Lahelma, L. Lundahl & E. Öhrn (Eds.) *Fair and competitive? Critical perspectives on contemporary Nordic schooling*. London: Tufnell Press. Pp. 1–22.
- Arnesen, A.-L., Lahelma, E., Lundahl, L., Öhrn, E. (2010). Agency in a Changing Educational Context: negotiations, collective actions and resistance. *European Educational Research Journal*, 9(2). 159–163.
- Arias, S. (2010). Rethinking space: An outsider's view of the spatial turn. *Geo-Journal*, 75(1), 29–41.
- Atkinson, P. (2017). *Thinking ethnographically*. London: SAGE.
- Atkinson, P. (2015). *For ethnography*. London: SAGE.
- Atkinson, P. & Coffey, A. (2003). Revisiting the Relationship Between Participant Observation and Interviewing. In: J. Holstein & J. Gubrium (Eds.) *Inside Interviewing*. London: Sage. Pp. 414–428.
- Bagga-Gupta, S. (2010). Creating and (re)negotiating boundaries: Representations as mediation in visually oriented multilingual Swedish school settings. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 23(3), 251–276, doi: 10.1080/07908318.2010.515997
- Baker, C. (2017). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. 6th Edition. Clevedon: Multilingual matters.
- Basic Education Act (628/1998). Retrieved from: <https://finlex.fi/fi/laki/ajantasa/1998/19980628>
- Beach, D. (2018). Whose justice is this! Capitalism, class and education justice and inclusion in the Nordic countries: race, space and class history. *Educational Review*, 69(5), 620–637. doi: 10.1080/00131911.2017.1288609

- Beach, D. (2011). On Structure and Agency in Ethnographies of Education: Examples from this special issue and more generally. *European Educational Research Journal*, 10(4), 572–582.
- Beach, D., From, T. Johansson, M. & Öhrn, E. (2018). Educational and spatial justice in rural and urban areas in three Nordic countries: A meta-ethnographic analysis. *Education Inquiry*, 9(1). 4–21.
- Belancic, K. & Lindgren, E. (2017). Discourses of functional bilingualism in the Sami curriculum in Sweden. *International Journal of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. doi: 10.1080/13670050.2017.1396283
- Bergroth, M. & Palviainen, Å. (2017). Bilingual children as policy agents: Language policy and education policy in minority language medium Early Childhood Education and Care. *Multilingua: Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 36(4), 375–399. doi:10.1515/multi-2016-0026.
- Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.
- Björklund, K. (2012). *Suomalainen, ruotsalainen vai ruotsinsuomalainen? Ruotsissa asuvat suomalaiset 2000-luvulla*. Tutkimuksia A41. Turku: Siirtolaisinstituutti.
- Blackledge, A. & Creese, A. (2012). Negotiation of Identities across Times and Spaces. In: M. Martin-Jones & S. Gardner (Eds.) *Multilingualism, Discourse and Ethnography*. New York: Routledge. Pp. 66–74.
- Blommaert, J. (2013). *Ethnography, Superdiversity and Linguistic Landscapes: Chronicles of Complexity*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Blommaert, J., Leppänen, S. & Spotti, M. (2012). Endangering Multilingualism. In: J. Blommaert, S. Leppänen, P. Pahta & T. Räsänen (Eds.) *Dangerous Multilingualism. Language and Globalization*. Palgrave Macmillan: London. Pp. 1–21.
- Blommaert, J. and Dong Jie (2010). *Ethnographic Fieldwork*. Bristol: Multilingual matters.
- Blommaert, J. (2006). Language Policy and National Identity. In: T. Ricento (Ed.) *An Introduction to Language Policy. Theory and Method*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. Pp. 238–254.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Boyd, S. & Huss, L. (2017). Young children as language policy-makers: studies of interaction in preschools in Finland and Sweden. *Multilingua: Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication* 36(4). 359–373.
- Boyd, S., Huss, L. & Öttesjö, C. (2017). Children’s agency in creating and maintaining language policy in practice in two “language profile” preschools

- in Sweden. *Multilingua: Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication* 36(4), 501–531.
- Boyd, S. & Huss, L. (2001). Introduction. In: S. Boyd & L. Huss (Eds.) *Managing Multilingualism in a European Nation-state*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. Pp. 1–12.
- Boyd, S. & Palviainen, Å. (2015). Building walls or bridges? A language ideological debate about bilingual schools in Finland. In: M. Halonen, P. Ihalainen & T. Saarinen (Eds.) *Language policies in Finland and Sweden. Interdisciplinary and multi-sited comparisons*. Bristol: Multilingual matters. Pp. 57–89.
- Brown, K. (2013). Language Policy and Education: Space and Place in Multilingual Post-Soviet States. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 33, 238–257.
- Burkitt, I. (2004). The time and space of everyday life. *Cultural Studies*, 18(2-3), 211–227.
- Busch, B. (2017). Expanding the Notion of the Linguistic Repertoire: On the Concept of *Spracherleben* - The Lived Experience of Language. *Applied Linguistics*, 38(3), 340–358. DOI: 10.1093/applin/amv030.
- Butler, A. & Sinclair, K. (2020). Place Matters: A Critical Review of Place Inquiry and Spatial Methods in Education Research. *Review of Research in Education*, 44(1), 64–96. DOI: 10.3102/0091732X20903303
- Cardinal, L. & Denault, A. (2007) Empowering Linguistic Minorities: Neo-liberal Governance and Language Policies in Canada and Wales. *Regional and Federal Studies*, 17(4), 437–456.
- Casey, E. (2013). *A Fate of Place: A Philosophical History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cenoz, J. & Gorter, D. (2017). Minority languages and sustainable translanguaging: threat or opportunity? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(10), 901–912.
- de Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. Berkeley: University of California.
- City of Helsinki (2019). Nordiska skolan suuntaviivat. Retrieved from: <https://www.hel.fi/kasvatuksen-ja-koulutuksen-toimiala/nordiska-skolan/nordiska-skolan-suuntaviivat>.
- Clark-Ibañez, M. (2007). Inner-City Children in Sharper Focus: Sociology of Childhood and Photo-Elicitation Interviews. In G. Stanczak (Ed.) *Visual Research Methods. Image, Society and Representation*. London: SAGE. Pp. 167–196.
- Coffey, A. (1999). *The Ethnographic Self: Fieldwork and the Representation of Identity*. London: SAGE.

- Corson, D. (2001). *Language diversity and education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Council of Europe (2017). European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages. Sixth report of the Committee of Experts in respect of Sweden.
- Council of Europe (2015). Application of the Charter in Sweden, Strasbourg 14 January 2015, 5th monitoring cycle. Report of the Committee of Experts on the Charter.
- County Administrative Board of Stockholm & Sami Parliament (2016). Nationella minoriteterna. Minoritetspolitikens utveckling år 2015. [National minorities. The development of minority policy in 2015.] Report.
- Delamont, S. (2014). *Key themes in Ethnography of Education*. London: SAGE.
- Dovemark, M., Kosunen, S., Kauko, J., Magnúsdóttir, B., Hansen, P., & Rasmussen, P. (2018). Deregulation, privatisation and marketisation of Nordic comprehensive education: social changes reflected in schooling. *Education Inquiry*, 9(1). 122–141.
- Education Act (2010:800). Retrieved from: https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/skollag-2010800_sfs-2010-800.
- Engman, M. (1995). Finns and Swedes in Finland. In: S. Tägil (Ed.) *Ethnicity and nation building in the Nordic world*. London: Hurst. Pp. 179–216.
- Erixon Arreman, I., & Holm, A.-S. (2011). Privatisation of Public Education? The emergence of independent upper secondary schools in Sweden. *Journal of Education Policy*, 26, 225–242.
doi:10.1080/02680939.2010.502701
- Finnish National Agency for Education (2014). *Perusopetuksen opetussuunnitelman perusteet /Grunderna för läroplanen för den grundläggande utbildningen* [Core curriculum for basic education]. Helsinki: National Agency for Education.
- Fjellman, A-M. (2019). *School choice, space and the geography or marketization. Analyses of educational restructuring in upper secondary education in Sweden*. Dissertation, University of Gothenburg.
- Flores, N. (2017). Bilingual Education. In: O. García, N. Flores & M. Spotti (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Pp. 525–544.
- From, T. (2019). *Minority language in the market – the case of Finnish in independent schools in Sweden*. Paper presented in the NERA conference, 7 March, University of Uppsala.
- From, T. & Sahlström, F. (2019). Rinnakkaisia tiloja – ruotsinkielinen koulutus suomalaisessa koulutusjärjestelmässä [Parallel spaces – Swedish-speaking education in the Finnish educational system]. In: T. Saarinen, P.

- Nuolijärvi, S. Pöyhönen & T. Kangasvieri (Eds.) *Kieli, koulutus, politiikka. Monipaikkaisia käytänteitä ja tulkintoja* [Language, education, policy. Multisited practices and interpretations]. Tampere: Vastapaino. Pp. 199–230.
- Gal, S. (2010). Language and political spaces. In: Auer & Schmidt (Eds.) *Language and space*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. Pp. 33–49.
- García, O., Flores, N. & Spotti, M. (2017). Introduction – Language and Society: A Critical Poststructuralist Perspective. In: O. García, N. Flores & M. Spotti (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Pp. 1–18.
- García, O. (2008). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: a global perspective*. Malden (MA): Blackwell.
- Giampapa, F. (2012). Authenticity, Legitimacy and Power. Critical Ethnography and Identity Politics. In: M. Martin-Jones & S. Gardner (Eds.) *Multilingualism, Discourse and Ethnography*. New York: Routledge. Pp. 75–83.
- Gordon, T., Hynninen, P., Lahelma, E., Metso, T., Palmu, T. & Tolonen, T. (2006). Collective ethnography, joint experiences and individual pathways. *Nordisk Pedagogik*, 26. 3-15.
- Gordon, T., Holland, J., Lahelma, E. & Tolonen, T. (2005). Gazing with intent: Ethnographic practice in classrooms. *Qualitative Research*, 5(1), 113–131.
- Gordon, T., Holland, J. & Lahelma, E. (2000). *Making spaces: Citizenship and Difference in Schools*. Houndmills, New York: Macmillan.
- Grin, F. & Schwob, I. (2002). Bilingual Education and Linguistic Governance: The Swiss experience. *Intercultural Education*, 13(4), 409–426.
- Gulson, K. N. & Symes, C. (2007). Knowing one’s place. Educational theory, policy, and the spatial turn. In: K. N. Gulson & C. Symes (Eds.) *Spatial Theories of Education*. New York: Routledge. Pp. 1–16.
- Gustafson, K. (2006). *Vi och dom i skola och stadsdel. Barns identitetsarbete och sociala geografier*. Dissertation, University of Uppsala.
- Gynne, A., Bagga-Gupta, S. & Lainio, L. (2016). Practiced Linguistic-Cultural Ideologies and Educational Policies: A Case Study of a “Bilingual Sweden Finnish School”. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 15(6). 329-343.
- Haarni, T., Karvinen, M., Koskela, H. & Tani, S. (1997). Johdatus nykymaantieteeseen. In: T. Haarni, M. Karvinen, H. Koskela & S. Tani (Eds.) *Tila, paikka ja maisema. Tutkimusretkiä uuteen maantieteeseen*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Hadi-Tabassum, S. (2006). *Language, space and power. A critical look at bilingual education*. Clevedon: Multilingual matters.

- Halonen, M., Ihalainen, P. & Saarinen, T. (2015) Diverse Discourses in Time and Space: Historical, Discourse Analytical and Ethnographic Approaches to Multi-sited Language Policy Discourse. In: M. Halonen, P. Ihalainen & T. Saarinen (Eds.) *Language Policies in Finland and Sweden. Interdisciplinary and Multi-sited Comparisons*. Bristol: Multilingual matters. Pp. 3–26.
- Harper, D. (2012). *Visual sociology*. New York: Routledge.
- Helakorpi, J., Ahlbom, I., From, T., Pörn, M., Sahlström, F. & Slotte-Lüttge, A. (2013). Särbo, sambo, kämppis: rektorers och lärares erfarenheter av kontakt och samarbete mellan samlokaliserade finsk- och svenskspråkiga skolor. A research report from the Språkmöten project. Retrieved from: https://blogs.helsinki.fi/spramoten/files/2013/10/Erill%C3%A4%C3%A4n_S%C3%A4rbo-2013.pdf
- Heller, M. (2011). *Paths to Post-Nationalism: A Critical Ethnography of Language and Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heller, M. (2010). The Commodification of Language. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 39, 101–114.
- Heller, M. (2008). Doing ethnography. In: L. Wei & M.G. Moyer (Eds.) *The Blackwell Guide to Research Methods in Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. Pp. 249–262.
- Heller, M. (2006). *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity: A Sociolinguistic Ethnography*. London: Longman.
- Heller, M. & Duchêne, A. (2012). Pride and Profit: Changing Discourses of Language, Capital and Nation-State. In A. Duchêne & M. Heller (Eds.) *Language in Late Capitalism: Pride and Profit*. New York: Routledge. Pp. 1–21.
- Heller, M. & Martin-Jones, M. (2001). Introduction: Symbolic Domination, Education and Linguistic Difference. In: M. Heller & M. Martin-Jones (Eds.) *Voices of Authority: Education and Linguistic Difference*. Westport-Conn: Ablex.
- Hélot, C. & De Mejía, A.-M. (2008). Introduction: Different Spaces – Different Languages. Integrated Perspectives on Bilingual Education in Majority and Minority Settings. In: C. Hélot & A.-M. De Mejía (Eds.). *Forging Multilingual Spaces. Integrated Perspectives on Bilingual Education in Majority and Minority Settings*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. Pp. 1–30.
- Henning-Lindblom, A. (2012). *Vem är jag, vem är vi, vem är vem i vårt land? Kontextens betydelse för gruppidentifikation och stereotypier bland svensk- och finskspråkiga i Finland och Sverige*. Helsinki: Forskningsinstitutet, Svenska social- och kommunalhögskolan vid Helsingfors universitet.

- Holm, G. (2018a.). Visual Ethnography in Education. In: D. Beach, C. Bagley & S. Marques da Silva (Eds.): *The Wiley Handbook of Ethnography of Education*. Medford: Wiley Blackwell. Pp. 325–354.
- Holm, G. (2018b.). Justice through education in the Nordic countries: critical issues and perspectives. *Education Inquiry*, 9(1), 1–3. doi: 10.1080/20004508.2018.1429770.
- Holm, G. (2014). Photography as a Research Method. In: P. Leavy (Ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Qualitative Methods*. Pp. 380–402.
- Hornberger, N. & Johnson, D.C. (2007). Slicing the onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, 14(3), 509–532.
- Hult, F. M. (2004). Planning for Multilingualism and Minority Language Rights in Sweden. *Language Policy*, 3(2). 181–201.
- Hult, F. M. & Hornberger, N. (2016). Revisiting Orientations in Language Planning: Problem, Right and Resource as an Analytical Heuristic. *Bilingual Review*, 33(3), 30–49.
- Hult, F. M., & Pietikäinen, S. (2014). Shaping discourses of multilingualism through a language ideological debate: The case of Swedish in Finland. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 13, 1–20.
- Huss, L. (2016). Language Education Policies and the Indigenous and Minority Languages of Northernmost Scandinavia and Finland. In: T. McCarty & S. May (Eds.) *Language Policy and Political Issues in Education*. New York: Springer International Publishing. Pp. 367–381.
- Hyltenstam, K. & Milani, T. (2004). Nationella minoriteter och minoritetsspråk. Uppföljning av Sveriges efterlevnad av Europarådets konventioner på nationell nivå: ett minoritetsspråksperspektiv. En rapport för konstitutionsutskottet. Stockholm: Centrum för tvåspråkighetsforskning, Stockholms universitet.
- Hyry-Beihammer, E. K. & Hascher, T. (2015). Multi-grade teaching practices in Austrian and Finnish primary schools. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 74. 104–113.
- Ihalainen, P. & Saarinen, T. (2015). Constructing ‘Language’ in language policy discourse: Finnish and Swedish legislative processes in the 2000s. In: M. Halonen, P. Ihalainen & T. Saarinen (Eds.) *Language policies in Finland and Sweden. Interdisciplinary and multi-sited comparisons*. Bristol: Multilingual matters. Pp. 29–56.
- Jeffrey, B. (2018). Ethnographic Writing. In: D. Beach, C. Bagley & S. Marques da Silva (Eds.): *The Wiley Handbook of Ethnography of Education*. Medford: Wiley Blackwell. Pp. 113–134.

- Johnson, D. C. (2017). Critical ethnography of language policy: A semi-confessional tale. In: M. Martin-Jones & D. Martin (Eds.) *Researching multilingualism. Critical and ethnographic perspectives*. New York: Routledge. Pp. 105–120.
- Johnson, D. C. & Johnson, E. J. (2015). Power and agency in language policy appropriation. *Language Policy*, 14, 221–243. DOI:10.1007/s10993-014-9333-z.
- Kajander, K., Alanen, R., Dufva, H., & Kotkavuori, E. (2015). Kielimuureja vai yhteiselo: odotuksia ja kokemuksia kahden kielen koulusta. In T. Jakonen, J. Jalkanen, T. Paakkanen, & M. Suni (Eds.), *Kielen oppimisen virtauksia. Flows of language learning*. AFinLA. Pp. 142–158.
- Kallio, K.P. (2005). Ikä, tila ja valta: koulu politiikan näyttämönä. *Terra*, 117(2), 79–90.
- Korkiasaari, J. & Tarkiainen, K. (2000). *Suomalaiset Ruotsissa. Suomalaisen siirtolaisuuden historia 3*. Turku: Siirtolaisuusinstituutti.
- Kortelainen, K. (2013). Muistin kuvia tehdasyhteisöstä. Moniaistisuus etnografiassa ja muistitietotutkimuksessa. In: P. Granö, A. Keskitalo & S. Ronkainen (Eds.) *Visuaalisen kokemus – johdatus moniaistiseen analyysiin*. Rovaniemi: Lapland University Press. Pp. 80–97.
- Kosunen, S. (2016). Families and the social space of school choice in urban Finland. Dissertation, University of Helsinki.
- Kovero, C. & Londen, M. (2009). *Språk, identitet och skola. En undersökning i svenska skolor i huvudstadsregionen*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Kovero, C. (2011). *Språk, identitet och skola II. Barn och ungdomar i svenska skolor i olika språkliga miljöer*. Helsinki: Finnish National Agency for Education.
- Kroskrity, P. V. (2004). Language Ideologies. In: A. Duranti (Ed.) *Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Malden, MD: Blackwell. Pp. 496–517.
- Lahelma, E. & Gordon, T. (2007). Taustoja, lähtökohtia ja avauksia kouluetnografiaan. In: S. Lappalainen, P. Hynninen, T. Kankkunen, E. Lahelma & T. Tolonen (Eds.) *Etnografia metodologiana*. Tampere: Vastapaino. Pp. 17–38.
- Laihonen, P. & Halonen, M. (2019). Vähemmistöt ja enemmistöt kieli-ideologiasina käsitteinä. In: T. Saarinen, P. Nuolijärvi, S. Pöyhönen & T. Kangasvieri (Eds.) *Kieli, koulutus, politiikka. Monipaikkaisia käytänteitä ja tulkintoja*. Tampere: Vastapaino. Pp. 61–90.
- Lainio, J. (2017). Nationella minoritetsspråk i skolan – Förbättrade förutsättningar till undervisning och revitalisering. A report by the Government Offices of Sweden, 2017:91. Retrieved from:

- https://www.regeringen.se/4ac2cd/contentassets/1223a145243f4c0aa25c0f3dc55b6965/sou-2017_91_webb.pdf
- Lainio, J. (2015). The art of Societal Ambivalence. In: M. Halonen, P. Ihalainen & T. Saarinen (Eds.) *Language Policies in Finland and Sweden. Interdisciplinary and Multi-sited Comparisons*. Bristol: Multilingual matters. Pp. 116–146.
- Lainio, J. (2001). The Protection and Rejection of Minority and Majority Languages in the Swedish School System. In: S. Boyd & L. Huss (Eds.) *Managing Multilingualism in a European Nation-state*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. Pp. 32–50.
- Language Act (2009:600). Retrieved from: https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/spraklag-2009600_sfs-2009-600
- Lappalainen, S. (2007). Havainnoinnista kirjoitukseksi. In: S. Lappalainen, P. Hynninen, T. Kankkunen, E. Lahelma & T. Tolonen (Eds.). *Etnografia metodologiana. Lähtökohtana koulutuksen tutkimus*. Tampere: Vastapaino. Pp. 113–134.
- Lappalainen, S. (2006). *Kansallisuus, etnisyys ja sukupuoli lasten välisissä suhteissa ja esiopetuksen käytännöissä*. Dissertation, University of Helsinki.
- Latomaa, S. & Nuolijärvi, P. (2005). The language situation in Finland. In: R.B. Kaplan & R.B. Baldauf Jr. (Eds.) *Language Planning and Policy in Europe, Vol. 1. Hungary, Finland and Sweden*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. Pp. 125–232.
- Latvalehto, K. (2018). *Finnish blood, Swedish heart. Examining Second-Generation Sweden-Finnishness*. Dissertation: Åbo Akademi University.
- Laurent, L. (2013). *Svenska språköar och finska utskär*. Magma-studie 3/2013. Helsinki: Tankesmedjan Magma.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lilja, N., Mård-Miettinen, K. & Nikula, T. (2019). Luokkahuone kielipoliittisena ja kielikoulutuspoliittisena tilana. In: T. Saarinen, P. Nuolijärvi, S. Pöyhönen & T. Kangasvieri (Eds.) *Kieli, koulutus, politiikka. Monipaikkaisia käytänteitä ja tulkintoja*. Tampere: Vastapaino. 175–198.
- Lindberg, C. (2019). Arbetet för en nordisk skola i Helsingfors inleds i februari – på schemat kan finnas danska och norska. Svenska Yle, 16.1.2019. Retrieved from: <https://svenska.yle.fi/artikel/2019/01/16/arbetet-for-en-nordisk-skola-i-helsingfors-inleds-i-februari-pa-schemat-kan-16.1.2019>.
- Lindberg, I. (2007). Multilingual Education: A Swedish Perspective. In: M. Carlson, A. Rabo & F. Gök (Eds.) *Education in 'Multicultural' Societies – Turkish and Swedish Perspectives*. Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul, Transactions, vol. 18. Pp. 71–90.

- Local Government Act (410/2015). Retrieved from:
<https://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/alkup/2015/20150410>
- Local and Regional Government Finland (2017). Ruotsin- ja kaksikieliset kunnat. Retrieved from: https://www.kuntaliitto.fi/sites/default/files/media/file/2017-02-ruotsin-ja-kaksikieliset-kunnat_0.pdf.
- Lorentz, H. (2013). *Interkulturell pedagogisk kompetens. Integration i dagens skola*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Lundberg, O. (2017). Obstacles to bilingual education: A case study of policy appropriation in a lower secondary school. *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 11(3). 29–54.
- Lundahl, L. (2016). Equality, inclusion and marketization of Nordic education: Introductory notes. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 11(1), 3–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745499916631059>.
- Lundahl, L., Erixon Arreman, I., Holm, A.-S. & Lundström, U. (2013). Educational marketization the Swedish way, *Education Inquiry*, 4(3), 497-517. DOI: 10.3402/edui.v4i3.22620
- Lönnroth, H. (2009). *Svenskt i Tammerfors. Tre undersökningar om språk och samhälle i det inre av Finland*. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Lönnqvist, N. (2019). Skolflytt oroar i Sibbo.: “Det svenska går garanterat förlo-
 rat för Söderkulla skola.” Hufvudstadsbladet, Oct 1, 2019. Retrieved
 from: <https://www.hbl.fi/artikel/skolflytt-oroar-i-sibbo-det-svenska-gar-garanterat-forlorat-for-soderkulla-skola/>.
- Löv, M. (2020). Språkbadsskolan i Jakobstad är redo för inflyttning: ”Få lärare i Finland har jobbat i en sådan här inlärningsmiljö.” Svenska Yle, Aug 3, 2020. Retrieved from: <https://svenska.yle.fi/artikel/2020/08/03/sprak-badsskolan-i-jakobstad-ar-redo-for-inflyttning-fa-larare-i-finland-har>
- Madison, D.S. (2012) *Critical Ethnography: Method, Ethics and Performance*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Makoni, S. & Mashiri, P. (2007). Critical Historiography: Does Language Planning in Africa Need a Construct of Language as Part of its Theoretical Apparatus? In: S. Makoni & A. Pennycook (Eds.) *Inventing and dis-inventing languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. Pp. 62–89.
- Makoni, S. & Pennycook, A. (2007). Inventing and dis-inventing languages. In: S. Makoni & A. Pennycook (Eds.) *Inventing and dis-inventing lan-
 guages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. Pp. 1-41.
- Manan, S. A., David, M. K. & Dumanig, F. P. (2016). Language management: a snapshot of governmentality within the private schools in Quetta, Pakistan. *Language Policy*. 15(1). 3–26.

- Mansikka, J. E., Holm, G. & Londen, M. (2013). Näkökulmia suomenruotsalaisen koulun identiteettirakennelmana –pääkaupunkiseudun opettajat kielten ja kulttuurin rajapinnoilla. In: L. Tainio & H. Harju-Luukkainen (Eds.) *Kaksikielinen koulu –tulevaisuuden monikielinen Suomi. Tvåspråkig skola – ett flerspråkigt Finland i framtiden*. Jyväskylä: FERA. Pp. 292–318.
- Marcus, G. (1995). Ethnography in/of the World System: The emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 24. 95–117.
- Martín-Bylund, A. (2017). Playing the game and speaking the right language: language policy and materiality in a bilingual preschool activity. *Multilingua*, 36(4). 477–499.
- Martin-Jones, M. & da Costa Cabral, I. (2018). The Critical Ethnographic Turn in Research on Language Policy and Planning. In: J.W. Tollefson & M. Pérez-Milans (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Language Policy and Planning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Pp. 71–92.
- Martin-Jones, M., Andrews, J. & Martin, D. (2017). Reflexive ethnographic research practice in multilingual contexts. In: M. Martin-Jones & D. Martin (Eds.) *Researching multilingualism. Critical and ethnographic perspectives*. New York: Routledge. Pp. 189–202.
- Martín Rojo, L. (2017). Language and power. In: O. García, N. Flores & M. Spotti (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Society*. New York: Oxford University Press. Pp. 77–102.
- Massey, D. (2005). *For Space*. London: SAGE.
- Massey, D. (1994). *Space, place and gender*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- McCarty, T. L. (2015). Ethnography in language planning and policy research. In: F. M. Hult & D. C. Johnson (Eds.) *Research methods in language policy and planning*. Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons. Pp. 81–93.
- McCarty, T. L. (2011). Introducing Ethnography and Language Policy. In: T. L. McCarty (Ed.) *Ethnography and Language Policy*. New York: Routledge. Pp. 1–28.
- McCarty, T. L. (2004). Dangerous difference: A critical-historical analysis of language education policies in the United States. In: J.W. Tollefson and A.B.M. Tsui (Eds.) *Medium of Instruction Policies: Which Agenda? Whose Agenda?* Lawrence Erlbaum: Mahwah, NJ. Pp. 71–93.
- McNamara, T. (2011). Multilingualism in Education: A Poststructuralist Critique. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3). 430–441.
- McRae, K. (2007). Toward language equality: four democracies compared. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2007(187–188), pp. 13–34.

- Menken, K. & García, O. (Eds.) (2010). *Negotiating language policy in schools: Educators as policymakers*. New York: Routledge.
- Mietola, R. (2007). Etnografisesta haastattelusta etnografiseen analyysiin. In: S. Lappalainen, P. Hynninen, T. Kankkunen, E. Lahelma & T. Tolonen (Eds.). *Etnografia metodologiana. Lähtökohtana koulutuksen tutkimus*. Tampere: Vastapaino. Pp. 151–176.
- Milani, T. (2007). Voices of Endangerment: A language ideological debate on the Swedish language. In: A. Duchêne & M. Heller (Eds.) *Discourses of Endangerment: Ideology and Interest in the Defence of Languages*. London, NY: Continuum. Pp. 169–196.
- Muhonen, A. (2013). Kenen (ruotsinsuomalaiset) kieli-ideologiat? *Kieli, koulu- ja yhteiskunta*, 4(4). Available online: <https://www.kieliverkosto.fi/fi/journals/kieli-koulutus-ja-yhteiskunta-lokakuu-2013/kenen-ruotsinsuomalaiset-kieli-ideologiat>
- Musk, N. (2010). Code-switching and code-mixing in Welsh bilinguals' talk: confirming or refuting the maintenance of language boundaries? *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 23(3), 179–197, DOI: 10.1080/07908318.2010.515993.
- Musk, N. & Wedin, Å. (Eds.) (2010). *Flerspråkighet, identitet och lärande*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- National Minorities and Minority Languages Act (2009:724). Retrieved from: https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/lag-2009724-om-nationella-minoriteter-och_sfs-2009-724.
- Niemi, A.-M. (2015). Erityisiä koulutuspolkuja? Tutkimus erityisopetuksen käytännöistä peruskoulun jälkeen. Dissertation, University of Helsinki.
- Nikula, T., Saarinen, T., Pöyhönen, S. & Kangasvieri, T. (2012). Linguistic Diversity as a Problem and a Resource – Multilingualism in European and Finnish Policy Documents. In: J. Blommaert, S. Leppänen, P. Pahta & T. Räsänen (Eds.) *Dangerous Multilingualism. Language and Globalization*. Palgrave Macmillan: London. Pp. 41–66.
- OSF, Official Statistics of Finland (2017): Population structure [e-publication]. ISSN=1797-5395. Annual review 2016. Helsinki: Statistics Finland [referred: 20.10.2019]. Available online: http://www.stat.fi/til/vaerak/2016/01/vaerak_2016_01_2017-09-22_tie_001_en.html
- Paju, E. (2015). Kuvallisuudet, osallisuus ja eettisyys lasten parissa tehtävässä tutkimuksessa. In: M. Mustola, J. Mykkänen, M. L. Böök & A.-V. Kärjä (Eds.) *Visuaaliset menetelmät lapsuuden- ja nuoruudentutkimuksessa*. Helsinki: Nuorisotutkimusseura. Pp. 119–127.

- Paju, E. (2013). *Lasten arjen ainekset. Etnografinen tutkimus materiaalisuudesta, ruumiillisuudesta ja toimijuudesta päiväkodissa*. Helsinki: Tutkijaliitto.
- Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. (2002). Mother tongues, governmentality and protectionism. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 154, 11–28.
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics. A critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Philo, C. & Parr, H. (2000) Institutional geographies: Introductory remarks. *Geoforum*, 31(4). 513–521.
- Piller, I. (2016). *Linguistic Diversity and Social Justice: An Introduction to Applied Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pink, S. (2015). *Doing Sensory Ethnography*. 2nd edition. London: Sage.
- Pink, S. (2007). *Doing visual ethnography: images, media and representation in research*. London: Sage.
- Rajander, S. (2010). *School and choice. An ethnography of a primary school with bilingual classes*. Jyväskylä: FERA.
- Rasmussen, K. (2004). Places for children – Children’s places. *Childhood*, 11(2). 155–173.
- Ricento, T. (2006). *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Ricento, T. (2000). Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policy and planning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 4(2). 196–213.
- Richardson, T. & Jensen, O. (2003). Linking Discourse and Space: Towards a Cultural Sociology of Space in Analysing Spatial Policy Discourses. *Urban Studies*, 40(1), 7–22.
- Rosa, J. D. & Burdick, C. (2017). Language Ideologies. In: O. García, N. Flores & M. Spotti (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Society*. New York: Oxford University Press. Pp. 103–124.
- Rose, G. (2012). *Visual methodologies. An Introduction to Researching with Visual Materials*. 3rd edition. London: Sage.
- Rose, G. (1993). *Feminism and Geography. The Limits of Geographical Knowledge*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*, (8)2, 15–34.
- Rönnlund, M. (2014). Schoolyard stories: processes of gender identity in a ‘children’s place’. *Childhood*, 22(1). 85–100.
- Saarela, J. & Finnäs, F. (2004). Interethnic wage variation in the Helsinki area. *Finnish Economic Papers*, 17(1), 35–48.

- Saarikangas, K. (2002). Merkityksellinen tila: lähiöasuminen arkkitehtuurin, asukkaiden, menneen ja nykyisen kohtaamisena. In: T. Syrjämaa & J. Tunturi (Eds.) *Eletty ja muistettu tila*. Helsinki: SKS. Pp. 48–74.
- Sahlström, F., From, T. & Slotte-Lüttge, A. (2013). Två skolor och två språk under samma tak. Teoksessa: L. Tainio & H. Harju-Luukkainen (toim.) *Kaksikielinen koulu – tulevaisuuden monikielinen Suomi. Tvåspråkig skola – ett flerspråkig Finland i framtiden*. 319–341.
- Salo, O. (2012). Finland's Official Bilingualism, a Bed of Roses or of Procrustes? In: J. Blommaert, S. Leppänen, P. Pahta & T. Räsänen (Eds.) *Dangerous Multilingualism. Language and Globalization*. Palgrave Macmillan: London. Pp. 25–40.
- Saukkonen, P. (2013). *Erilaisuuksien Suomi*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language Policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. New York: Routledge.
- Siekkinen, F. (2017). Flerspråkiga elever i en enspråkig elevnorm. *Educare*, 2017:1. 27–49.
- da Silva, E., McLaughlin, M. & Richards, M. (2007). Bilingualism and the globalized new economy: the commodification of language and identity. In: M. Heller (Ed.) *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. Pp. 183–206.
- Sjöberg, S., Mård-Miettinen, K., Peltoniemi, A. & Skinnari, K. (2018). *Kielikylpy Suomen kunnissa 2017: Selvitys kotimaisten kielten kielikylvyn tilanteesta varhaiskasvatuksessa, esiopetuksessa ja perusopetuksessa*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Swedish National Agency for Education (2014). Privata aktörer inom förskola och skola – en kartläggning. Retrieved from: <https://www.skolverket.se/getFile?file=3307>
- Swedish National Agency for Education (2011, revised 2018). *Curriculum for the compulsory school system, the pre-school class and the leisure-time centre*. Stockholm: The Swedish National Agency for Education.
- Swedish School Ordinance (2011:185). Retrieved from: <http://www.noti-sum.se/rnp/sls/lag/19941194.htm>
- Slotte-Lüttge, A., From, T. & Sahlström, F. (2013). Tvåspråkiga skolor och lärande – en debattanalys. In: L. Tainio & H. Harju-Luukkainen (Eds.) *Kaksikielinen koulu – tulevaisuuden monikielinen Suomi*. Jyväskylä: FERA. Pp. 221–244.
- Slotte-Lüttge, A., Sahlström, F., Hummelstedt, I., Rusk, F. & Grönberg, J. (2010) *Ökad språklig medvetenhet. Både mer och mindre finska. En fallstudie av en samlokalisering av en svensk- och finskspråkig skola i Finland*. Research report from the *Språkhus* project. Vasa: Åbo Akademi.
- Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Språkbadskskolan/Kielikylypykoulu (2020). The presentation of the language immersion school in Jakobstad. Retrieved from: <https://www.sprakbadsskolan.fi/>
- St Pierre, E. A. (2000) Poststructural Feminism in Education. An overview. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*. 13(5), 477–525.
- Sundman, M. (2013). Kaksikielisiä kouluja kaksikieliseen Suomeen? In: L. Tainio & H. Harju-Luukkainen (Eds.) *Kaksikielinen koulu – tulevaisuuden monikielinen Suomi*. Jyväskylä: FERA. Pp. 47–67.
- Syrjänen Schaal, K. (2013). Marginalized and Ignored. National minority children's struggle for language rights in Sweden 2013. Retrieved from: http://ungfin.se/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/206507_SvK.pdf.
- Szabó, T. P., K. Kajander, R. Alanen & P. Laihonon (2018). Zusammenarbeit über Sprachgrenzen hinweg: Sprachauffassungen von Lehrern in örtlich zusammengelegten Schulen mit Schwedisch und Finnisch als Unterrichtssprachen. *Der Deutschunterricht*, Vol. 4, 53–59.
- Tallroth, P. (2012). Strategy for the national languages in Finland. Prime Minister's Office Publications 7/2012. Retrieved from: http://www.oikeusministerio.fi/material/attachments/om/toiminta/perusoikeudetjademokratia/6F3CYgZBf/Kansalliskielistrategia_engl.pdf.
- Thrift, N. (2006). Reinventing invention. *Economy and Society*. 35(3). 279–306.
- Tollefson, J. (2006) Critical Theory in Language Policy. In: T. Ricento (Ed.) *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theories and Method*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. Pp. 42–59.
- Tolonen, T. & Palmu, T. (2007). Etnografia, haastattelu ja (valta)positiot. In: S. Lappalainen, P. Hynninen, T. Kankkunen, E. Lahelma & T. Tolonen (Eds.). *Etnografia metodologiana. Lähtökohtana koulutuksen tutkimus*. Tampere: Vastapaino. Pp. 89–112.
- Troman, G., Jeffrey, B. & Beach, D. (2006). Researching Education Policy: Ethnographic Experiences. London: Tufnell Press.
- Tuomela, V. and Hyltenstam, K. (1996). Hemspråksundervisningen. In: K. Hyltenstam (Ed.) *Tvåspråkighet med förhinder? Invandrar- och minoritetsundervisning i Sverige*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- UNICEF Office of Research (2018). An Unfair Start: Inequality in Children's Education in Rich Countries. *Innocenti Report Card 15*, UNICEF Office of Research – Innocenti, Florence.
- Valentine, G. (2001). *Social geographies: Space and society*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.
- Vallius, P., Syrjänen Schaal, K. & Teilus, M. (2005). Rätten till mitt språk. Förstärkt minoritetsskydd. SOU 2005: 40. Stockholm.

- Varjo, J., Kalalahti, M. & Lundahl, L. (2015). Recognizing and controlling the social costs of parental school choice. In: G.W. Noblit & W.T. Pink (Eds.) *Education, Equity, Economy: Crafting a New Intersection*. Dordrecht: Springer. Pp. 73–94.
- Vuorsola, L. (2019). Societal support for the educational provision of Finnish in the Swedish school system in theory and practice. *Language Policy*, 18(3), 363–385. doi: 10.1007/s10993-018-9491-5.
- Walford, G. (2018). Recognizable Continuity: A Defense of Multiple Methods. In: D. Beach, C. Bagley & S. Marques da Silva (Eds.): *The Wiley Handbook of Ethnography of Education*. Medford: Wiley Blackwell. Pp. 17–30.
- Walford, G. (2008). *How to do educational ethnography*. London: Tufnell Press.
- Walsh, J. (2012) Language policy and language governance: a case-study of Irish language legislation. *Language policy* 11(4), 323–342. doi: 10.1007/s10993-012-9238-7
- Wolcott, H. (2008). *Ethnography: A way of seeing*. 2nd edition. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.
- Zilliacus, H., Holm, G. & Sahlström, F. (2017). Taking steps towards institutionalising multicultural education – The national curriculum of Finland. *Multicultural Education Review*, 9(4), 231–248.
- Zilliacus, H., Paulsrud, B. & Holm, G. (2017). Essentializing vs. non-essentializing students’ cultural identities: curricular discourses in Finland and Sweden. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 12(2). 166–180.